DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 623 UD 026 612

AUTHOR	Kelley, Tina
TITLE	Small Change: The Comprehensive School Improvement Program.
INSTITUTION	Educational Priorities Panel, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Nov 88
NOTE	107p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Attendance; Decentralization; *Educational Facilities Improvement; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Education; Government Role; Improvement Programs; Leadership Responsibility; Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Instruction; Parent Participation; Participative Decision Making; Program Budgeting; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Reading Improvement; School Based Management; Staff Development; *State Programs; Theory Practice Relationship; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive School Improvement Program; *New York

ABSTRACT

The Comprehensive School Improvement Program (CSIP), which was mandated by New York State to address issues of school reform, was a disappointment both in the way the State conceived the program and in the way it was implemented. CSIP was designed to encourage cooperative planning among teachers, principals, parents, and other school staff to foster school-based decision-making. Schools were mandated to participate in this project if they were designated on the State's Comprehensive Assessment Report list of schools needing substantial improvement in third and sixth grade reading and math scores, as well as attendance. This report reviews the following: (1) the State's responsibility; (2) shortcomings of the Board's implementation of CSIP; (3) description and history of CSIP; (4) description of the CSIP facilitators; (5) results of visits to seven CSIP sites; (6) how CSIP fell short of its theoretical goals; (7) how CSIP's implementation was inadequate; (8) CSIP decentralization; (9) next steps; and (10) recommendations for changes on the state level, the structure of CSIP, and the implementation of CSIP. Appendices include the following: (1) excerpt from section 100.2 of the Commissioner's regulations; (2) CSIP data; and (3) descriptions of the seven CSIP sites visited. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

12-13-88

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin Wilner

Interface

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED302623

SMALL CHANGE:

THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Dr. Margaret Nuzum, Coordinator
(718) 768-3121

INTERFACE, Staff

In New York City:
666 Broadway
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2121

In Albany:
119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

UD026612

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Educational Priorities Panel

Dr. Margaret Nuzum
Coordinator

Advocates for Children
American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter
American Reading Council
ASPIRA of New York
Association for the Help of Retarded Children
Center for Public Advocacy Research
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.
The City Club of New York
Community Council of Greater New York
Community Service Society
The Junior League of Brooklyn
The Junior League of New York City, Inc.
League of Women Voters of New York City
Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP
National Black Child Development Institute, Inc.
New York Coalition of 100 Black Women
New York Urban Coalition
New York Urban League
Presbytery of New York City
PROGRESS, Inc.
Public Education Association
Resources for Children with Special Needs, Inc.
Rheedlen Foundation
United Neighborhood Houses
United Parents Associations
Women's City Club of New York

Support for the Educational Priorities Panel for 1987-88 has been provided by:

Aaron Diamond Foundation
American Express Foundation
Chase Manhattan Bank
Chemical Bank
Citibank
Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
Robert Sterling Clark Foundation
Consolidated Edison of New York
Fund for the City of New York
Leon Lowenstein Foundation, Inc.
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company
Merrill Lynch & Company, Inc.
Metropolitan Life Foundation
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company
New York Community Trust
New York Foundation
New York Times Company Foundation, Inc.
Helena Rubinstein Foundation
The Salomon Foundation, Inc.
Scherman Foundation
Time Inc.
Uris Brothers Foundation

Management Staff - INTERFACE

666 Broadway, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2121

Stanley S. Litow, Executive Director
Robin Willner, Staff Director
Lynn Yanis, Project Director

119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

Tina Kelley, Project Associate
Sandra Moore, Administrative Assistant

EDUCATIONAL
PRIORITIES
PANEL

Dr. Margaret Nuzum, Coordinator
(718) 768-3121

INTERFACE: Staff

In New York City:
666 Broadway
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2121

In Albany:
119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

SMALL CHANGE:
THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

November 1988

Tina Kelley, Author
Robin Willner, Staff Director

MEMBERSHIP: Advocates for Children • The American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter • American Reading Council, Ltd. • ASPIRA of New York • Association for the Help of Retarded Children • Center for Public Advocacy Research • Citizens Committee for Children of New York, Inc. • The City Club of New York • Coalition of 100 Black Women • Community Council of Greater New York • Community Service Society • Junior League of Brooklyn • The Junior League of New York City, Inc. • League of Women Voters of the City of New York • Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP • National Black Child Development Institute of New York • New York Urban Coalition • New York Urban League • Presbytery of New York City • PROGRESS, Inc. • Public Education Association • Resources for Children with Special Needs • Rheedlen Foundation • United Neighborhood Houses • United Parents Associations • Women's City Club of New York

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

System-wide Problems 5

The State's Responsibility 5

Shortcomings of the Board's Implementation of CSIP 8

1. Staff Development 9
2. Staffing 10
3. Parents 10
4. LEP Students 10
5. Accountability 11
6. Testing 11

Description and History of CSIP 14

Description of the CSIP Facilitators 20

Visits 22

CSIP's Overall Results 38

Quantitative Measures 38
Qualitative Measures 40

Issues of Concern 43

A. How CSIP Fell Short of its Theoretical Goals 43

1. Strong Administrative Leadership 43
2. Climate of Expectation 46
3. Atmosphere Conducive to Instruction 48

B. How CSIP's Implementation was Inadequate 51

1. Staff Development 51
2. Staffing 53
3. Parents 54
4. Limited English Proficient Students 54
5. Accountability 56
6. Testing 56
7. Lack of Funding 57

CSIP Decentralization 59

Next Steps 61

Recommendations 62

A. Changes on the State Level 62
B. Structure of CSIP 62
C. Implementation of CSIP 64

Appendices

INTRODUCTION:

It is common knowledge that the quality of education offered in the city's schools must be improved, if the city and its children are going to thrive in the next century. By all indications, one would have expected the state mandated Comprehensive School Improvement Program (CSIP) to address issues of school reform.

Unfortunately, although it has some positive elements, the program over all is a disappointment both in the way the state conceived the program and in the way it was implemented. Originally based on the philosophy of school-based planning for effective schools, it provides the city's schools with only a shadow of the resources needed to provide disadvantaged students with comprehensive basic skills. Improving local planning is obviously a logical first step towards framing needed reforms, but new resources, including staff development, technical assistance, an adequate physical plant, and funding, must be added if significant change is to be achieved. In a city where improving schools should be the system's first priority, it is unacceptable that CSIP has been a peripheral add-on program, deprived of the opportunity to succeed in most schools.

In recent years, educational reforms have increasingly centered on the need for school-based planning and improvement efforts at the building level. CSIP was designed to encourage cooperative planning among teachers, principals, parents, and other school staff to foster school-based decision-making. Each CSIP Committee received $400 to help implement its plans, a meager amount. Schools were

mandated to participate in this process if they were designated on the state's Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) list as schools needing substantial improvement in third and sixth grade reading and math scores, as well as attendance. Staff and parents are required to develop plans for school improvement, then work to implement them. To examine the effectiveness of the program, the Educational Priorities Panel has studied CSIP and its effects on these lower-achieving schools, and made recommendations about the program's future.

The sole cause of the problems in the CAR schools is not inadequate planning, although that is what the State program has chosen to concentrate on. As the EPP's research shows, school-based planning is not a panacea. At-risk students in the public schools need leaders to take risks for them, to work toward addressing the real problems in the schools. These include inequitable funding, inadequate and overcrowded buildings, and a dearth of qualified teachers. Currently, there is sufficient public will for a turnaround in the schools, and there are opportunities for significant legislative reform and for improvements at the Board of Education in New York City. Much work needs to be done before school-based planning efforts can show meaningful results.

The body of literature on effective schools and school improvement indicates several prerequisites for school revitalization. According to a paper given by the late Ron Edmonds, a Harvard professor and former official of the New York City Board of Education, who was a pioneer in these issues, effective schools have the following characteristics:

"--They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together.

"--Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement.

"--The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand.

"--Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities." *

Research also indicates that school improvement programs need a time commitment of between 5 and 10 years, allocations of $50-$100 per student per year, and a system that can bring its political muscle behind them in order to succeed. Programs must be school-based and supported by the principal, and must provide time for staff to meet and adequate training for participants.

The Comprehensive Assessment Report merely lists the most visible problem schools in the state, using the most easily measured data. Although it may not wish to, it stigmatizes schools, branding them as In Need of Improvement, when every school in New York City and State meets that criteria, and their staffs should be planning together now to work toward significant change at the building level.

Staff at many of the schools visited for this study deeply resented their official designation as CAR schools, resentment that often eclipsed efforts to improve their schools. As seen in the

---

* Edmonds, Ronald, "A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling," Harvard University, 1978.

reports from principals to the central CSIP office, many schools focused entirely too much effort on making excuses for poor test scores and attendance rates. Principals were often defensive and blamed their school's problems on housing in the neighborhood, unhappy students, mobility, overcrowding, and even on the lack of pre-school education of the parents, issues that cannot be addressed directly through CSIP. There are schools that have accomplished their objectives and improved student outcomes. However, in the opinion of many staff members, school improvement has become a burden instead of an opportunity for growth.

SYSTEM-WIDE PROBLEMS:

Many of the widespread problems staff at CAR schools identified are clearly out of the scope of the specific process of CSIP at the school level. The state legislature has the authority to solve some of them; others fall under the authority of the Central Board of Education. For CSIP to be effective, however, these issues must be addressed. A school cannot progress if it wins the battle of initiating school-based planning, when it has no ammunition for the war of school improvement. CSIP Committees need to see leaders on the state and city level who have strong commitment to solving issues such as school financing, overcrowding, and staffing.

The State's Responsibility

As the Educational Priorities Panel has repeatedly asserted, the formula for state aid to education discriminates against New York City. The city receives 33.2 percent of state education funds, even though it educates more than 37 percent of the state's students. Due to disparities between funding for attendance versus enrollment, 135,000 youngsters in New York City are currently ignored by the state aid formula. In addition, the formula does not take into consideration the special needs of the students the city educates. New York City has a disproportionate number of the state's poor children, students requiring remediation, children in temporary housing, and limited English proficient students, and does not receive equitable assistance from the state in addressing their needs.

It shouldn't be surprising that, absent the base funding required to provide for students who are in need, an underfunded categorical program designed to help school plan will not work. It is ridiculous for the state to have an underfunded effort to address school improvement, which should be a broad, central goal of every school. Not only are our schools underfunded, but the funding they do receive is often too restrictive. The proliferation of categorical funds has impeded the flexibility of the local school staff. Schools need funding to direct as they see fit to implement their plans. If the program wants to increase accountability on the school level, it should provide schools with a sufficient number of qualified staff, give them the flexibility to make their own budget allocations according to the school's needs as they perceive them, and then hold schools accountable based upon agreed upon goals. School improvement should not be an add-on program, but a pervasive, school-wide, system-wide initiative, supported and not impeded by the State.

Another issue that is at least partially a responsibility of the State legislature is the disgraceful status of the city's school buildings, and the need both for new construction and rehabilitation. Blame for this decay can be placed at both the City of New York and the Board of Education. During the fiscal crisis of the 1970s, the city did not maintain its schools, and bad management at the Division of School Buildings impeded the scanty work that did occur.

Resolution of the issue is currently out of the Board's hands, however, as lawmakers are now considering a bill to create a school construction authority, to build schools more quickly, efficiently

and at a lower cost. As we saw in our analysis of CSIP, both overcrowding and classrooms that are a shambles hamper school improvement efforts and ruin morale. Lack of space was one of the the most frequent complaints in the schools the Panel visited. Unlike revisions in the funding formula, a new construction authority would not require additional dollars, and would in fact attract $600 million in Municipal Assistance Corporation surplus funds to the city's schools.

Finally, the state is apparently ignoring the city's upcoming need for more than 40,000 qualified teachers over the next seven years. The state-mandated Board of Examiners requires New York City teachers to go through duplicative written exams and additional hurdles before they can teach. These exams are not required in over 700 other local school districts in the state. The procedures do not result in more qualified teachers for the city's schools, and in fact discourage people from working here, at an annual cost of $6 million a year. A bill before the legislature could eliminate the Board of Examiners, and significantly alleviate staff shortages. The $6 million could be better used toward needed staff recruitment and staff development.

Currently, due in part to delays at the Board of Examiners, most new teachers enter the system with temporary teaching certificates. A disproportionate number of these unlicensed teachers, who have the least classroom experience, are assigned to the most challenging schools, those with high dropout rates, poorer students, and higher staff turnover. This latter factor jeopardizes the

chances for a consistent school improvement program. These issues further illustrate how the school system has neglected students most at risk of failure.

The State Education Department, in creating its CAR list, merely identified the most glaring problem schools and suggested a revision of management practices to address them. The Department told the schools that school-based planning, in and of itself, should be able to bring about meaningful improvement. The state did not provide adequate funding, staff development or technical assistance to schools. Meanwhile, it has ignored its role as an advocate on crucial issues that affect all schools in the city.

Shortcomings of the Board's Implementation of CSIP

While reforms in the legislature are underway in Albany, the New York City Board of Education must follow its own agenda for system-wide improvements, to make school-based improvements more likely. Issues for the local school administrators to address include providing services to limited English proficient (LEP) students, creating a more efficient bureaucracy that will serve instead of overburden the schools, and ensuring that CSIP Committees on the school level are properly structured and able to work efficiently.

The Board is making progress in decentralizing its bureaucratic functions and in improving personnel recruitment. For example, staffing the schools went more smoothly this fall, with over 6,000 new teachers hired, compared to 3,360 the previous year. More teachers than were needed in September received preservice training,

a great improvement over last year, when only one-third received the mandated staff development, due in part to delays at the Board of Examiners and the Division of Personnel.

Despite these recent advances, school-based planning has not yet resulted in meaningful reform on the building level. The Panel's research discovered the following areas in need of improvement:

1. Staff Development

The Central Board has not provided effective staff development for CSIP Committee members, who had deep misconceptions about the school improvement program and what it could offer the school. When the program did not meet their unrealistic expectations, they became disillusioned and much less effective. Teachers need better pre-service training on school-based planning, as well as workshops on the needs of particular student populations, effective programs and curriculum development.

Staff development for principals is a particularly crucial need, as principal support for school-based planning is a prerequisite for its success. We found that schools with principals who believed in the process could report more school improvements as a result. All staff must be given whatever training and technical assistance they request from headquarters. Raising expectations and demanding progress is not a program for success. Staff who take the time to examine their problems and seek alternatives must be given tools for change.

2. Staffing

CSIP schools tend to be hard to staff. One school the Panel visited reported a vacancy as late as the beginning of May. It is difficult to recruit experienced staff to many CAR schools. While the state-mandated Board of Examiners is a critical problem, the Division of Human Resources must also move to improve staff recruitment and assignment. High turnover rates further complicate CSIP, as Committees have less continuity in staff from year to year. In addition, staff shortages make it more difficult to arrange for common meeting times.

School staff often have to go without facilitators, and take a great deal of time and energy getting used to new ones. Facilitators, the skilled central staff who provide technical assistance to CSIP Committees, are a crucial factor in CSIP, as they can provide this assistance, a disillusioned and ineffective staff can not be expected to solve their school's problems just by meeting together more frequently. Unfortunately, facilitators have a very high turnover rate, with 23 percent leaving their positions the first year of the program. This severely impedes the work of the CSIP Committees, who rely on the facilitator for weekly assistance.

3. Parents

Parent involvement on CSIP Committees was uneven, with some schools having inadequate representation. Parents often had difficulty attending CSIP meetings because of schedule conflicts.

4. LEP Students

In too many of the schools the Panel visited, limited English proficient students were not receiving the services to which they

are entitled by law. There was inadequate coordination between CSIP planning and planning for the needs of LEP students and other students with special needs.

5. Accountability

There are no incentives or sanctions for a school's performance in school based planning. The lines of authority are not clear between the school planning committee, the district superintendent and school board, and the Chancellor, and no one is held ultimately responsible for a school's plan and its implementation.

6. Testing

Criteria for a CAR school's performance do not reflect the problems the staff identifies in a school, and staff are not able to rate progress in their school according to their views of its needs. The written tests used to determine CSIP eligibility do not provide a comprehensive, accurate measure of student progress.

# # #

More change is needed, and the public will hold the State, the Central Board, and district and school staff responsible for timely improvements. The three groups must avoid the temptation to blame each other and must concentrate on their specific responsibilities. The public is ready to hold each player accountable for reform. Many schools have made improvements in spite of numerous barriers. It is time to work to make success the norm, not the exception.

The program's goal of increasing collaboration among staff was not achieved in all the schools the Panel visited, and in any case improved collaboration does not necessarily result in improved

instruction in the classroom. A positive school environment is necessary but not sufficient in and of itself to improve student test performance, currently one of two criteria used for determining which schools participate in CSIP.

The Panel's Monitoring Committee visited seven elementary schools involved in CSIP during the spring term, 1988. These schools, in seven districts within four of the boroughs, were chosen in a way to provide geographic diversity, as well as a variety of student populations, i.e., one school with a large percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students and one with many students in temporary housing. Members of the Monitoring Committee developed interview guides, spoke with principals, teachers, other staff, parents, and central CSIP coordinators, and toured each school during these visits. Panel staff also met with the administrators of the central CSIP office at the Board of Education and spoke with State Education Department (SED) officials. Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning Process 1986-87, the report of the Board's Office of Educational Assessment, also provided figures on test scores and the opinions of school staff citywide.

The Panel's report includes many wide-ranging recommendations for funding, flexibility, accountability, and staff development. The overriding keys to meaningful school improvement rest in the hands of the state legislature:

- a School Building Authority serving the city,
- the abolition of the Board of Examiners, and
- equitable state aid for New York City.

With these items in place, plus the recent decentralization of the facilitators and with implementation of the Panel's recommenda-

tions on local CSIP policy, intelligent school-based planning can proceed. We can then expect meaningful reform on the school level, designed by the people who know best what their students need.

DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY OF CSIP

In 1984 the Regents Action Plan was approved, including stipulations for stronger state accountability for pupil performance and school improvement. As a result of criticism that New York State was not ensuring that schools were educating students properly, the State Education Department developed a mechanism for identifying schools in need of improvement. In 1985, it released its first annual Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) list. It cited the worst performing New York State public and private schools, based on percentages of students in grade three and grade six who attained the State Reference Point (SRP) on the Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) reading and math tests, as well as attendance rates.* (High schools were designated according to their scores on the Regents Competency Tests in reading, writing and math, the percentage passing Regents exams, and graduation rates.) The Boards of Education governing these designated low-performing schools were required to begin a Comprehensive School Improvement Process, to "improve education through an ongoing, school-based collaborative planning process."

In 1985 the staffs of the existing School Improvement Program (SIP) and the Local School Development program were merged to form the Central Board of Education's Office of Comprehensive School

---

* Special education students whose Individual Education Plans exempt them from citywide tests, and students who are limited Engligh proficient and have not yet received two full years of English language instruction at the time of testing are not required to take the tests.

Improvement Program (OCSIP). These earlier programs were smaller and aimed at helping a few schools. SIP, for example, which began in 1979, was not mandated and had no time restrictions. It served 10 nonpublic and 60 public schools in six years. A majority of the school staff had to support the program before it could be adopted. The Central SIP office had a staff of 10-12, compared to the current OCSIP staff, which numbered 63 people before its decentralization (see page 59). The Board of Education's summative evaluation of the first three years of SIP called it "a successful approach to improving the instructional, administrative and school climate aspects of school." Reading and math scores in most SIP schools had increases in the percentages of students reading at or above grade level.

In contrast, CSIP (the school-based planning process, with or without assistance from Central) is mandated for every CAR school and is governed by specific regulations in Part 100 of State Education Regulations (see Appendix A). This provides guidelines and outlines school goals, although it does not provide exact scores to be attained. CSIP is a more "bottom-up" approach to school improvement, according to Leonard Clarke, OCSIP's Director.

In the central OCSIP, there were 56 facilitators, five coordinators, a director and assistant director, and support staff, to serve approximately 250 schools in 29 of the city's 32 community school districts. In 1987-88, the office's costs were $5.5 million, which included stipends, all salaries, other than personnel services, and consultant fees.

SED gave schools identified in 1985 two years to develop and implement a school improvement plan, except for schools in New York City, which were put on a different schedule to complete this task. With such a large number of CAR schools, the city was given a later due date for submitting its CSIP plans to SED and did not have to identify new CAR schools in the program's second year. (At this writing the city is waiting word from SED about its request to postpone having new schools for another year.) It was also given an additional year (1986-87) for program implementation. With release of the most recent CAR list, New York City was back on schedule with the rest of the state, according to Irving Hamer, SED's former deputy commissioner, who worked closely with the CSIP program. The State Commissioner of Education has set higher state standards in compiling the 1988 list. Cutoff scores were raised 20 percentage points for grade three mathematics, 13 for reading and for grade six mathematics, and nine for grade six reading.

In the second year of the program, schools were expected to begin implementing their plans, selecting "implementation activities consistent with the schools' resources and district philosophy." Schools were encouraged not to build additional financial resources into their CSIP plans, as the state believed improvement was possible with existing funding.

In New York City, former Chancellor Nathan Quinones received a waiver from SED to institute his Minimum Standards as the goals for CSIP schools. These standards were higher than the state's, and incorporated the Degrees of Reading Power test (DRP), as well as the CAR criteria. For example, to meet the minimum standards,

schools had to have at least 65 percent of students score at or above the SRP on the grades 3 and 6 PEP test, and the grade 6 DRP test. Sixty percent of students must attain the SRP on the DRP, and the average daily attendance rate must be at least 90 percent. Also, progress standards were set: 70 percent of all students in Quartile I (the bottom quartile) must make gains of 10 DRP units. These local standards represent absolute standards for schools to aim for, which are more challenging than the state's relative standards. The city standards give schools concrete goals, while the schools may retain their CAR designation if they remain in the bottom percentage of schools statewide, even if they have made significant progress.

In each desginated school, a committee including the principal, teachers, parents, and other staff creates a school improvement plan, linked to performance goals. Staff members and parents volunteer for these positions. Unfortunately, this selection method does not yield the group most representative of the school. The plans must be approved by SED, which recently finished examining them, and has sent them back to the districts for review. SED noted where it needed more information or where plans were insufficient, including where schools who had already met the Chancellor's Minimum Standards needed plans for continued improvments. If a school does not address these concerns, the state will review it again. Schools must continue CSIP for three years, whether or not they meet standards earlier.

As of April, 1988 there were 436 out of approximately 6,300 public and non-public schools in New York State on the CAR list, down from 504 (eight percent of schools statewide) in 1985, the program's first year. Of the 1985 schools, 393 or 78 percent were

located in New York City. In 1988, at least 417, (96 percent) of the schools on the CAR list are in New York City. This includes eight public schools identified for the first time in the new list.

In New York City, only 201 of the 417 CAR schools received from OCSIP technical assistance such as access to staff development workshops and regular meetings with the CSIP Committee. Of these schools, 90 were assisted in the first year, while 111 were added to the process in 1986. CSIP schools were designated by the Community School District Superintendent as most in need of formal assistance, with schools "Under Review" by the former Chancellor automatically receiving help with CSIP. According to Mr. Clarke, other city CAR schools are still expected to complete the school-based planning and improvement process and can request assistance from the Board on their own, although most do not request help from Central. Approximately 40 others request technical assistance but are not assigned facilitators. Citywide goals for 1986-1987 included training facilitators in CSIP procedures, helping CSIP teams revise their plans for approval by SED, and providing all CSIP schools with on-site staff development.

Schools receiving direct Central assistance are assigned a facilitator from OCSIP, who meets weekly with staff to help them develop their plans and work together effectively. In addition, 20 districts have assigned a district CSIP liaison to work with the Central Board office. This is not a full-time position, except in District 27.

Once SED approves school improvement plans Mr. Hamer estimates that 60-70 percent of them are implemented "in one way or another."

Problems include conflicts between administrators and the planning effort, poor coordination with other planners in the school, and, the most difficult to overcome, lack of physical facilities for new programs. Staff identified the lack of space in the school and lack of funds as the most common roadblocks to implementing plans. In the seven schools the Panel visited for this study, there was no mention of facilitators' having helped committees or principals reallocate funds to implement CSIP plans.

There are safeguards in place to ensure plans are implemented. If a school is not fulfilling its CSIP plan, OCSIP and the CSIP Borough Coordinator will intervene and meet with the principal and committee, to offer them guidance. According to Mr. Clarke, in most cases this is sufficient to bring about change. If the administration is being uncooperative, OCSIP will contact the district superintendent, although this has only been necessary for seven or eight schools.

Each school on the CAR list received $400 for equipment or supplies from the CSIP office. Grants for Improved School Services for LEP Students, a state program, provided grants of up to $20,000 to schools with significant numbers of limited English proficient (LEP) students. In addition, Mr. Hamer instituted the Intensive Supportive Systems, which provided $5,000 to 40 schools that were nearing the CSIP standards. Selected districts received $10,000 for staff development improvements. The Leon Lowenstein Foundation also awarded $230,000 to five schools, chosen through a competitive process, to address their most critical needs. Finally, grants

were available from SED for schools that applied for them and could present exemplary improvement plans.

Board of Education employees who are members of the CSIP committee receive $120 a year stipend for their services. Parent representatives receive $90 a year. This amount is intended to cover expenses for the meetings, such as childcare and carfare. It is not an hourly fee.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CSIP FACILITATORS

Across the state schools do not have in-school facilitators, ut have itinerant ones responsible for different counties. In New York City some districts are assigned full-time facilitators; others have the equivalent of half a position. CSIP facilitators are chosen from the ranks of regular teachers who responded to advertisements. According to Mr. Clarke, the criteria for selection included supervisory experience, human relations skills, prior experience as master teacher or teacher trainer, an ability to work in the classroom, evidence of being a "change agent," knowledge of the role of the principal, and some administrative leadership experience. Past work with parents or training was also desirable. The Central Board trained facilitators in process skills, analyzing and presenting data, and conflict resolution. They learned to develop and give workshops.

Many of the techniques developed for the earlier SIP were used to train the CSIP facilitators, including workshops in group process skills, situational leadership, and new content area staff development. Experienced facilitators trained new ones. Workshops originally

were not intended to prepare the facilitators to conduct staff development sessions in these areas, but to acquaint them with available research and curriculum so they could share it with the schools. Staff development for facilitators continues throughout the year and occurs twice a month. New components to it begin every three months, on topics such as modifying a CSIP plan, content areas, stress management, and management style. Recently, OCSIP has offered more subject area staff development to facilitators, so they could offer it to their CSIP Committees.

Facilitators work with their CSIP Committees to help implement plans. They offer or arrange for staff development sessions with staff, attend weekly committee meetings and subcommittee meetings, and get together frequently with committee chairpeople. They offer suggestions and bring in experts from the districts when possible. They look at a school's budget, but according to Mr. Clarke, do not make recommendations about budget reallocations that might be helpful for school improvement efforts. He said the principal has very little leeway in budgetary decisions, due to categorical programs and other restricted funding. There are certain allocations, however, like Basic School Staffing, that require staff and parent input. Facilitators have also suggested that staff arrange for common prep periods, but have not provided enough advice to staff needing assistance in rescheduling.

The 56 facilitators are paid as regular assigned teachers, even though they work an additional month and a longer day. They take on the position because it is satisfying and gives them a chance to grow professionally, according to Mr. Clarke. They are

seen as effective people, and have many opportunities for problem solving. Many facilitators have gone on to positions as principals, assistant principals, superintendents and deputy superintendents. Between five and ten leave each year for higher positions. Their high turnover rate (23 percent left after the program's first year) has been troublesome, as schools must become accustomed to new facilitators or share the time of one from another district.

VISITS

The schools EPP visited varied in the success of their school-based planning, the achievement levels of their classes, the socio-economic status of their students, the condition and utilization rates of their buildings, and other factors. A short description of each school follows, including excerpts from each school's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan, as submitted to SED and the Board. Also included are the Panel's comments on these excerpts. (See Appendix B for a chart of school improvement statistics and Appendix C for full descriptions of each visit.)

School A

I. EPP Site Visit

Located between Hell's Kitchen and the middle West Side, this school has a large percentage of students from temporary housing. The administration keeps their attendance rates separately, so as not to penalize the school. This is not an accepted practice under legal definitions of attendance rates.

Staff felt insulted by the school's CAR designation, although morale is now up. Staff is less confident because of high turnover among the key CSIP players--principal, facilitator, and coordinator. CSIP has resulted in some staff development from the district, and the school bought new software, in line with CSIP's goals. Special education and regular teachers are interacting more because of CSIP. Two parents who had been active in the Committee meetings have

since become paras in the school. A community association works with the hotels, and the school has hosted math workshops for parents, teaching them to make math manipulatives.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

As a result of the prior administration's philosophy of running the school "Top Down," it was difficult for staff members to deal with the decision-making process. We have, however, begun making significant progress.

As a result of staff's direct input, a new Reading Program was ordered and put into effect in September of 1987. This same process is now in operation regarding a school-wide Science Program which we will implement in September of 1988.

Our CSIP Discipline Sub-Committee came up with a working code of behavior for students.

An impressive Student Honor Roll Program was introduced and has been most favorably received by the staff, students and parents. My CSIP Chairperson has been instrumental in helping me organize a worthwhile Student Council.

We have been working very hard to try to service our hotel population. These children do not come to school as often as they should. A Community Associate, Special Reading Teacher and district personnel have been helping us deal with this problem. As a result of poor attendance, these children affect our attendance statistics as well as our Reading and Math scores.

I am very proud of the fact that we are a MODEL READ ALOUD school.

A Parent Honor Roll lists with pride the names of parents who read to their children at home.

Our facilitator's input, advice, and guidance is very much appreciated and acknowledged.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

Workshops in Math, Reading, Language and Library Skills, Classroom Management, Computers, Big Books, Testing Integration with Learning, and AIDS Awareness.

Revised scheduling for special subjects, allowing for more grade conferences.

More consultation with and effective use of support staff and parents.

Visits to welfare hotels, consultation with parents.

For non-hotel children, a boys basketball team, with cheerleaders, as well as a track and field team.

Expansion of LEP and ESL services.

B. School Environment/Climate

Principal's Honor Roll for behavior and scholastic achievement, with badges and a special honors assembly. Parent volunteers are also given badges.

Grades 4-6 student council formed.

Peer helpers wear badges when they supervise younger children.

New amenities for teachers lounge.

Developed code of behavior handbook.

Physical activities were organized during recess, and a screen was bought to show movies on rainy days.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

Mandated read-aloud program. Parent recognition for those who read aloud to their children.

All staff filled out needs assessment sheet.

More paras hired for Project Child. Early childhood committee established. Project Alert whole language program begins for grades K and 1.

New uniform reading series used throughout the grades, and daily read-aloud program instituted.

III. Comments

The principal here seems supportive of the CSIP process, which has resulted in curricular improvements and scheduling to allow for teachers to meet more frequently. The honor roll for parents or siblings who read to their children is a creative idea, and it is good that the school recognizes parent volunteers at assemblies. The school is egergiously out of compliance with the Aspira Consent Decree. It provides afterschool services such as the basketball and track teams, but these are not open to younger homeless students, who especially need them. They cannot participate in such afterschool activities because they must board their buses immediately after classes.

School B

I. EPP Site Visit

The staff of this very overcrowded school in a very overcrowded district in upper Manhattan was not disturbed by its CAR designation, as the principal had predicted it. The CSIP process has been in place a year, and the committee has focused on students reading below grade level, and LEP students. Staff was frustrated that the Central Board lost its needs assessment, and that the plan took so long to develop. The CSIP Committee was involved in the decision of how to spend Basic School Staffing allocations, and worked for a large staff development program for English as a Second Language and math. Overcrowding has kept the committee from beginning several programs, including a parents workshop.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

The school population is of approximately 1,550 students, and their socioeconomic level is very low. Seventy-five percent are eligible for free breakfast and lunch, the majority of which are Hispanic, primarily from the Dominican Republic. Many of these students have had large gaps in their education and are consequently limited in their native language Spanish. The school population is 51 percent limited English proficient. However, since the vast majority of our students are not native born and Spanish is the primary home language, children in our mainstream program are, in effect, also limited English proficient. Although many have made tremendous strides in English language acquisition, (some achieving gains of 2 or more years in a 10 month school period), they still fall far below the national average. On each grade we have organized a transitional class.

The school was constructed in 1905 and was intended for the maximum use of 1,000 students. Today, we far exceed that number by 550. Making our over utilization rate 155 percent. Our overcrowded situation creates negative conditions where education is severely hampered. Class sizes of 38, supplementary programs housed in corridors, lack of supplies and equipment, lack of experienced pedagogical personnel. These and many other factors make our jobs increasingly difficult.

The fact that we have no gymnasium serves to restrict our physical education program.

We are forced to feed approximately 225 students every 25 minutes in order to provide lunch for all our children, thus making our three lunch periods a highly orchestrated feat that creates numerous problems.

Due to the age of the building and the extremely high utilization rate, there are many maintenance and custodial problems.

The ever-rising number of children in need of remedial help in the areas of reading and mathematics coupled with the large numbers of students who are in need of guidance or special education services, add enormous pressure to our staff. High mobility rates among the students also contribute to low achievement scores and place added burdens on our teachers and paraprofessionals. Given all the poor school conditions and the numerous student needs our reading scores continue to improve. It is our hope that the collaborative planning of our staff will enable us to continue our improvement in the academic achievement of our students.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

Additional guidance was obtained. We now have a bilingual teacher/counselor in addition to the regular guidance counselor.

Transition classes were established on every grade for children exiting the bilingual program. These classes provide a sheltered transition into monolingual classes with continued Spanish Reading/Language Arts and emphasis on English as a Second Language.

A survey was taken to determine staff's perceived needs and desires with regard to staff development. The results were given to staff and supervisory staff.

A series of ESL workshops have been held for the staff. In addition, a grant was received which allows a number of teachers to be paid at per session rates to receive ESL training after school.

B. School Environment/Climate

For the last two years, orientation meetings were held in the fall for parents. They were organized by class. The parents learned about the curriculum for the year, homework policy and other teacher expectations.

The timeclock was abolished.

Changes were made in the lunchroom to ease crowding, provide more supervision and give the children incentives for good behavior and cleanliness.

A large parenting conference has been held each year with concurrent workshops, a cultural program and breakfast. Over half the staff has actively participated in the preparation of the conference.

Conversational Spanish classes are being conducted for interested staff once a week after school.

A CSIP newsletter has been published.

The average daily attendance has increased from 88.5 percent to 89.9 percent.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

CSIP submitted and received a grant for a special K-1 reading program called "Giant Step."

A second grant was received which includes an after-school remedial and ESL program for limited English proficient students four days a week. This began in April 1988.

Since the inception of the CSIP plan, standardized reading scores have improved from 34 percent to 52 percent.

III. Comments

This school has an LEP transitional class for every grade, which might provide a useful model for the Board of Education's new transitional services. In another exemplary program, the district-wide Golden Hour, each staff member is responsible for a small group of students who do silent reading for the first hour each day. Note that the additional guidance counselor was a result of central funding, not CSIP efforts. The principal notes many reasons that the school has had trouble, but this has not prevented CSIP from making progress, (not the least of which is the removal of the time clock.) The CSIP Committee had the motivation to apply for various grants, and the school offers its staff ESL and Spanish classes. The parent conference is a very positive step and very well attended.

School C

I. EPP Site Visit

The principal of this school in the South Bronx attributed many of the school's problems to factors outside the school, and he did not think it was fair to compare his schools with more affluent ones across the state. He felt CSIP "may well prove to be counter-productive." He said the process did bring problems to the forefront to be discussed with parents and staff, although there was seldom enough time during the schoolday to meet. He resented the lost instructional time and bureacratic costs CSIP entailed, but said meeting after school was not feasible, due to limited reimbursements. He did not attribute new changes in the school to CSIP, although he said that the peer group of the Committee was encouraging faculty

involvement. The Committee has brought in staff developers, although the principal believes what teachers really need is better preparation for teaching from the education schools. The school has numerous incentive programs for students to read and write.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

The CAR report which identified the schools in need and which evolved into the CSIP was extremely faulty as to process and may well prove to be counter productive.

Schools were compared on a statewide basis and unfair comparisons were made and published. Schools from affluent/middle class areas were compared with urban schools. Pre-school education (birth to 1st grade) of both parents and children is a major variable which must be addressed. Positive attitudes towards school and readiness skills must be developed very early.

The state has not provided resources to alleviate these differences. A comparison of entry-level achievement and terminal grade growth would have been more equitable to inner city schools. The time, effort and personnel spent on all of these CAR activities could have been better spent as resources to help the schools in need.

The major problem in our schools is not knowing what is needed but in bringing all the resources to bear on the problem.

The CSIP process has been helpful in building morale and collaborative spirit, but the underlying conditions of poor student readiness skills, pre-school education, parental involvement, and inadequate university training for teachers must be addressed in order to attack the problems in a comprehensive manner.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

1. Greater teacher input/involvement.
2. Appointment of grade leaders.
3. More frequent grade meetings.
4. Administration willingness to make program changes to accommodate paired teacher reading programs.
5. Attendance policy put into effect.

B. School Environment/Climate

1. Detention room set up two days a week.

2. Parents restricted from entering building and picking up children early.

3. School policy for lateness put into effect.

4. Formulation of heterogeneous grouping as opposed to homogeneous grouping has cut down discipline problems.

5. Monthly awards assembly schedule for reading, attendance, citizenship.

6. Less classroom interruptions.

7. Follow-up on classroom thefts.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

1. Increased staff development - Workshops for new teachers, referrals, discipline techniques.

2. Distribution of "cloze" materials earlier in school year.

3. Elimination of additional paperwork.

4. List of reading material made available to teachers.

5. Greater input on book orders - e.g., elimination of CIMS workbook.

III. Comments

The principal made a great deal of excuses for his school's performance, and his resentment of CSIP is reflected in the quality of the school's "major" accomplishments. These include steps that should be standard operating procedures such as appointing grade leaders, having attendance and lateness policies, and following up on classroom thefts. The policy of restricting parents from entering the building to pick up their students early could alienate parents. Tightening security would be more conducive to parent involvement.

School D

I. EPP Site Visit

This school had a school improvement process before the official CSIP, and feels the new program is more closely documented. The school is very overcrowded, with no library, and four classes

meeting in the gym. The lunch periods are only 30 minutes long, making it difficult for teachers to find times to meet during the school day. Most subcommittees meet before school. Parent attendance at meetings has not been good. The principal was very supportive of CSIP, and has visited schools in Dade County, Florida to study school-based options, a concept he supports. CSIP at School D resulted in a reference library for teachers, which has boosted morale. The facilitator noted that the principal believed in the CSIP process. The CSIP Committee wanted to donate their honoraria to the school, to use for supplies. When they discovered they were being taxed for the stipend anyway, they were furious. The facilitator spent the school's $400 in discretionary funds for science supplies. A school candy sale raised $1000 for CSIP efforts, giving each teacher $25 for supplies or discretionary projects.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

We are still functioning without a library and four classes are using the gymnasium.

The mobility rate also continues to increase over the years. The number of children who remain from kindergarten through 6th grade is minimal.

With all the negatives that affect the teaching-learning situation, the school still functions for the children. The teachers have shown a caring, positive attitude. Our parents have been helpful in their attempts to make the situation as positive as possible and the test scores indicate growth. Staff and pupil morale is generally very good.

[from the CSIP chair's narrative:]
CSIP progress has been uneven so far at PS 94 for the 1987-88 school year. Several staff stalwarts have earned positions worthy of their talents elsewhere,and we are trying to recruit new workers into our ranks. Staff development in the area of reading for grade three teachers was a focal point this year. The teachers worked toegether enthusiastically to improve instruction in reading and the content area of social studies. Parent workshops have continued with noticeably high attendance. The CSIP subcommittee attendance has thinned with a subsequent reduction in planning and implementing programs. There have been fewer collegial workshops in curriculum and management.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

Our Cluster Reading Program is functioning smoothly. We are planning to revitalize our Math Tutorial Program with peer-tutors. Our In-House Detention Program is running well. We have re-organized our Committee for the Improvement of Student and Staff Morale.

B. School Environment/Climate

New windows were put in during the school year. We await their completion and installation of shades. Our school is scheduled for painting this summer.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

Our Grade Three Reading Program focused on improvement of reading in the content area of Social Studies. Our part-time Student Reference Library is functioning. We have a Teacher-Mentor Program with two teacher-interns and one mentor.

III. Comments

The school has a very supportive principal, who believes that teachers should have input to decisions in the school. However, the report from the CSIP chair and sketchy "major accomplishments" indicate that the Committee has not been able to achieve the improvements one would expect from a school with a supportive administration.

School E

I. EPP Site Visit

The principal of this school in a poor section of the mid-Bronx described the current school year as a disaster. The school survived only because of the dedication of the staff, who functioned well despite teacher shortages and numerous absences. This has restricted classroom coverage, making it difficult for teachers to find times to meet. She said the CSIP plan succeeded because it was the product of a group. It has resulted in a weekly networking day for teachers during their lunch hours, and occasional breakfasts. Almost every teacher is involved in CSIP in some way. Teachers have also been given more control over purchases and the allocation of funds. The staff would not have accepted a plan designed only by the principal, she said. The principal said morale has increased greatly, although when visitors spoke to the head of the CSIP committee in the teachers' room, she was very frustrated by staff vacancies, lack of supplies, and poor staff morale.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

We had a most difficult school opening. Due to hiring freezes at the district level, our school had three vacancies until January 1988. It should be noted that we still have one vacancy. This coupled with our staff absentee rate, seriously disrupted our academic program. It also made it difficult to hold CSIP sub-committee meetings as often as we had in previous years.

However, creative scheduling and commitment to the CSIP process made it possible to continue programs such as our weekly networking sessions, our Honor, and Attendance assembly programs. In addition, we have now expanded our honors assembly to include a VIP (Very Important Parent) award.

We did not receive appropriate NYSTL funds. Therefore, many of our students were unable to participate in the Holt school-wide reading program, because we were unable to purchase readers for each child.

We fully support the need for greater articulation among the various persons servicing our student body -- (i.e., Chapter I, Resource Room, Bilingual Coordinator, Classroom teacher, etc.). However, we are seeking technical assistance in the area of scheduling in order to meet the mandate for congruence.

Many more students from the Special Ed Unit will be integrated in regular education academic programs next school year.

The number of youngsters experiencing socialization and emotional problems are increasing. It is most crucial that pupil personnel services such as a guidance counselor be provided.

[School E] has a new custodian who has aggressively followed up on all requests for repairs. Staff morale has grown since the appearance of the building has improved. Further, the custodial staff now attends our CSIP meetings and a greater spirit of cooperation is in evidence.

A series of workshops have been conducted in assertive discipline by the CSIP facilitator and our supervisory staff. These workshops have been extremely helpful to both our experienced and new staff.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

Daily sale of pretzels has been established. To date a xerox machine has been leased. This purchase currently provides individual use of machine by teachers.

Each Wednesday during lunch hour, teachers meet and share information. Each meeting is attended by an administrative staff member.

The committee is currently working on a plan to establish a group leader for lower and upper grades. This individual will be responsible for keeping the teacher on each grade level informed of all current administrative information and/or changes.

B. School Environment/Climate

Staff members were active participants in school wide breakfasts and luncheons which increased socialization amongst staff members.

An honor roll bulletin board was established in the school to reward students for their accomplishments.

Staff members attended district workshops to foster professional growth.

Student participation in extra-curricular activities. Latch-key program and local day care programs and PASE program.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

We have chosen from our school staff, experienced teachers in presenting model lessons in reading, math and writing.

Our school also requested the CSIP district facilitator to coordinate a math workshop given in the use of math manipulations.

The CSIP facilitator presented a workshop on Effectiveness Classroom Management, specifically management of student behavior.

As a result of our weekly networking sessions, the third grade classes in our school coordinated a program concerning Career Day and worked on the publication of a Career Newsletter containing interviews, compositions and a message by our principal.

Our school has been granted two mentor teacher positions at the latter part of this year. Each mentor will work closely with two interns new to the teaching profession. Preparation periods would be devoted to the mentoring process.

III. Comments

The school's problems with vacancies and funds have hampered its progress. When we spoke to the principal and CSIP chair on separate occasions, their views of the school and its morale differed greatly. However, the staff has actively encouraged its staff to socialize, student extra-curricular programs have been instituted, and staff development has increased through CSIP. The school consistently lists mandated or citywide programs as "major accomplishments."

School F

I. EPP Site Visit

The principal was new to this Crown Heights school as of September, and felt the teachers were "ready to fight" at first, although morale has increased significantly, due to increased communication. The school has adopted the SIMS math program to increase the school's math scores, its major problem. The program will have peer teaching and a master teacher components. The principal questioned CSIP's effectiveness, as some meetings turned into gripe sessions. She has seen schools improve without going through the formal procedures. Three parents have been involved in every CSIP meeting, and two more have attended some. The school has sponsored a homework workshop to help parents help their children with homework, so they are no longer embarrassed when their kids ask for help.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

During the year 1987-1988 certain goals and objectives were not realized.

Children are rewarded for excellent behavior while traveling throughout the school building, also on trips, and for academic achievement.

A structured program will be instituted in 1988-1989 school year. This year it is evident that this program is greatly needed.

Reasoning skills will be presented to all classes - kindergarten through grade 5.

Teachers will continue to attend workshops in writing through Staff Development Conference, at Columbia, the district and at school.

A representative from Central Board will be invited to give the Staff Conference at our school.

Classes in writing will include kindergarten through grade 5.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

One of the goals since 1985 has been a strong commitment to staff development. This past year, several staff development days were designated. Emphasis was placed on uses of materials of instruction, methodology and evaluative procedures. Informal, as well as

formal observations of new teachers were made by the assistant principals. Post-observation conferences were held.

This year a teacher mentor was designated to help new teachers. This was not fully implemented as yet.

Since September 1987, [School F] has been in a state of transition -- changing from one administration to the present. It will apparently take additional time to achieve a school run with maximum efficiency.

B. School Environment/Climate

Conditions are unsanitary, as well as unattractive. Floors, bathroom facilities, teachers' rooms, classrooms are not sufficiently cleaned. Subcommittees regarding these matters were formed in the past. However, little, if any, positive results are evident.

Parents are invited to attend curriculum workshops. Attendance at these workshops could be much greater.

The teaching staff is occasionally cited for its achievements at school luncheons. However, the morale this year seems to be on the decline. This is probably due to irregular prep schedules, inequities in certain areas of school responsibilities and dismal school surroundings.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

New curriculum goals were proposed. The CIMS management system, with monthly evaluative procedures in math, will be initiated in September 1988. The Open Court reading system is also to be instituted through the grades in 1988.

Books, materials, etc. are still needed by teachers on various grades. Complete sets of books in all areas, for all teachers, are always needed.

III. Comments

The principal's report was illogical, disjointed and hard to decipher. It is hard to know whether the "several staff development days [that] were designated" were a result of CSIP or were just the city-wide in-service days. Observations by assistant principals of new teachers should be standard operating procedure, not listed as a "major accomplishment." No reasons were given for failure to address lowered staff morale. These should be addressed, not merely listed. As in other schools, it is difficult to determine if the decision to adopt new curriculum emerged from CSIP or would have occurred without it.

School G

I. EPP Site Visit

This Queens school resented being designated as a CAR school, as it made the list by only half a percentage point. It is not eligible for Chapter I funding, so its staff has only two preps a week and no extra personnel. Grade conferences can only meet once a month. The administrators felt the staff's expectations were raised unfairly, as they hoped additional resources would accompany the CSIP process. They felt they had worked hard and not received much in return. They did not attribute improvements in the school to CSIP, except for focused attention and improved adminstrative style, possibly a function of new leadership. Last year the CSIP Committee voted to disband, as they had met the standards. All but three members quit, although new members continued the process. There have been complaints about the amount of paperwork involved.

II. Extracts from Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

PRINCIPAL'S NARRATIVE

School G was originally cited for being deficient in grade 3 reading and math during the 1983-84 school year. However, as of the spring of 1987 it had met the standards in all areas.

The CSIP Committee functioned until June, 1987, when most of the teacher members informed the previous principal that they would not continue their participation on it during the next school year.

Most of the teachers had not been very enthusiastic about participating in this process because they believed that the school never should have been cited.

The CSIP Committee has been meeting before school approximately twice a month. Attendance has been good and minutes of these meetings have been distributed to the entire faculty. Furthermore, Committee members have been communicating informally with their colleagues concerning the work that is being done at these meetings.

There was no chairperson during the 1987-88 school year.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. School Organization/Leadership

The School Organization/Leadership Subcommittee has not met on an ongoing basis.

B. School Environment/Climate

The School Environment/Climate Committee met and discussed teacher morale.

A Student Handbook was developed to incorporate school rules of behavior. The Handbook has not yet been published.

C. Curriculum/Basic Skills

The Curriculum/Basic Skills Subcommittee has not met on an ongoing basis.

III. Comments

This school is a classic example of CAR designation causing resentment and the refusal to improve a school that, like any school, could use it. Under the acting principal the CSIP Committee has encouraged the new CSIP Committee to meet, but it has not accomplished anything significant.

CSIP's OVERALL RESULTS

Before assessing the major issues raised in the site visits and CSIP plans in detail, it is helpful to understand the various outcomes attributed to the program. There are two ways to measure CSIP's results -- according to objective test results indicating student achievement, and through more subjective criteria, such as improvement in school climate. Both methods have inherent weaknesses.

Quantitative Measures

Test scores are subject to bias and inaccuracies, and may not reflect the abilities of students who do not test well. According to Mr. Hamer, "It's a valid criticism that the nature and culture of the schools are very different from what's tested." By looking at only the third and sixth grades, the CAR criteria do not accurately represent the entire school. Students whose third grade scores were judged one year are not monitored the same way the next year, and the new scores cover a new cohort of students. Tests measure only certain experiences, not necessarily those addressed by CSIP. Students may make significant progress in other areas, such as attaining English proficiency or improving their attitudes toward learning. Teachers face the temptation to teach to the tests, putting more emphasis on test-taking skills and less on critical thinking or creativity. Finally, school improvement efforts cannot be expected to show dramatic results in a matter of two years, and test scores may lag behind goals accordingly. The following figures should be viewed with these caveats in mind.

According to the Board's OEA report, "The program achievement objective was that CSIP schools would demonstrate a five percent or more increase from 1986 to 1987 in the number of students performing at or above grade level in reading, writing, and mathematics." In fact, only nine percent of the schools increased their DRP scores by the required amount, with the percentage of students reading at grade level decreasing by 2.3 percent in CSIP schools. Only 24 percent met the five percent increase goal in the MAT math test, and 39 percent did in the MAT reading test.

In the schools EPP visited, only Schools C, D and F met the five percent increase goal on the DRP in both grades, as of the end of CSIP's second year. (Scores per each grade from the 1987-88 school year are not yet available.) School A had an increase of close to 20 percent in third graders meeting the State Reference Point, and while its percentage of sixth graders on level decreased by almost as much. Schools A, B, C, E and G showed increases in 1985-86 followed by decreases in 1986-87 in at least one grade, and all but two of the seven schools showed decreased results on this test on at least one grade level during the three years for which data was collected. In the schools visited, none met the local minimum standard that 70 percent of all students in the first (bottom) quartile make gains of 10 DRP units. The only information available yet for 1987-88 is schoolwide and it shows that three of the four schools showed an overall decline from the prior year, in in each case reversing earlier success. Finally, only one school, B, increased attendance over three years. Only two of the schools,

F and G, are at or above the minimum standard of 90 percent daily attendance, and both have showed steady decline.

These results show that in some tests, going through the formal school improvement process does not give schools an edge in the test performance of their students. For example, in the MAT reading test, schools that had participated in one year of CSIP showed a mean gain of one percentage point in the number of students at or above grade level, while other citywide schools gained 2.4 percentage points. Likewise, in the DRP test, only eight percent of two-year CSIP schools had attained a five percent increase in students performing at grade level, while 11 percent of both the one-year CSIP schools and other CAR schools did. In this test, however, scores decreased citywide.

Similarly, in the MAT math test 24 percent of CSIP schools met the five-percent gain, compared to 28 percent of the CAR schools. On the other hand, in the MAT reading test, CSIP schools outperformed both CAR schools and schools citywide on this scale, with 39 percent meeting the increase goal, compared to 35 and 37 percent, respectively, in other CAR and citywide schools. It must be remembered that in comparison to other CAR schools, CSIP schools have been designated as more in need of technical assistance, with two-year CSIP schools more needy than those who have received assistance for one year.

Qualitative Measures

According to the State Education Department's 1985 Guide to the Comprehensive Assessment Report,

> While a Comprehensive Assessment Report can serve as a useful vehicle for a discussion of student achievement,

> those who review a CAR should be aware of its limitations. There are...many intended outcomes of instruction that are not measured by State tests. Among such outcomes are attitudes.

The Guide then quoted from the 1984 "Statement of Regents Goals for Elementary and Secondary School Students," which describes a list of desired outcomes, including appreciation of culture and civilization, artistic talent, civic values, understanding and respect of divergent backgrounds, career skills, emotional and physical health, and an understanding of the dangers of substance abuse. According to the Guide, "Performance skills and product development are other outcomes that are not adequately measured at present."

The Guide also noted that high schools provide the existing tests to their students at "widely disparate points" in the school year. "Schools may elect to test as early as the beginning of eighth grade or as late as the end of ninth grade, a difference of almost two years." Schools with widely varying practices cannot accurately be compared to each other. This only applied to the Preliminary Competency Test, which is not given to elementary students.

However, more subjective results, including staff reports on the success of the program, may give another perspective, which may be biased in favor of the process. Most of the teachers and parents interviewed during the Panel's site visits were actively involved in CSIP and were vested in believing in and talking about the process' success. Their comments could also be colored by the presence of the principal during most meetings. This became particularly apparent in School E, where researchers spoke with the

CSIP chair in the teacher's room, when the principal was not present (see p. 31). The accounts of the two women on the conditions and morale in the school diverged widely.

According to the OEA report, 94 percent of the committee members and 83 percent of the principals felt their meetings were productive. Staff at five out of seven schools the Panel visited indicated that CSIP increased collaboration in the school. Principals have also been generally supportive, although several of those the Panel interviewed appeared to use the CSIP Committee as an advisory group, with little actual planning power. Mr. Clarke said currently the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (CSA), the principals' union, has indicated that all school committees should be subcommittees of the CSIP committee. He added that some schools have become more aware of the data used to judge them, figures the principals and staff may not have looked at before. This should enable them to clarify their missions through the process of developing a school plan, and they should now know how data can help them. However, at least three of the seven principals interviewed for this study said they had expected their school's CAR designation. The OEA study found that one-third of the principals "indicated they had used similar data for planning and improvement before the CSIP training."

Improvements in administration and in the coordination of planning do not in and of themselves result in better instruction for students, however. While a collaborating staff may have higher morale, this improvement alone is not enough to ensure a better education for pupils in schools in need of improvement.

ISSUES OF CONCERN

In New York City, school improvement efforts have been half-hearted and have not had a significant impact on school operations in most schools. The Comprehensive School Improvement Program is particularly disappointing when judged against three of the criteria Ron Edmund presented for judging effective schools:

- strong administrative leadership,
- a climate of expectation, and
- an atmosphere conducive to instruction.

After discussing how CSIP did not meet these theoretical goals, this section will present problems in the implementation of CSIP, including issues around funding, personnel, and accountability.

A. How CSIP Fell Short of its Theoretical Goals

1. Strong Administrative Leadership

The success of a CSIP committee's initiatives often hinges on the superintendent's and principal's commitment to the process, commitment that, systemwide, has been mixed, at best. For example, one superintendent wanted all his district's CSIP funds to go to him, to be allocated in a top-down fashion, as he felt a district insider would be better able to understand local problems. He showed little respect for the school-based process the Board outlined. As a compromise, Mr. Clarke let him hire a facilitator from his district.

A CSIP committee with an unsympathetic principal will not likely see funds spent according to its recommendations. According to Mr. Hamer, "principals are in some places a problem, not suppor-

tive of the collaborative approach. They see CSIP as a usurpation of their authority in the building, with the facilitators as interlopers. It's not a problem of the structure in the process, but with old-time principals." Several of the principals in schools visited for this study were cynical about CSIP and its value, or about the need for change in the first place. The principal of School C showed very little interest in new programs to serve his poorer-achieving students and felt CSIP could be "counterproductive," although School E's principal said her school's plan could not have succeeded without the staff's input.

Clearly, the principal has the power to stifle CSIP if he or she feels threatened by it. Mr. Hamer acknowledged that there were schools and districts where administrators did not invite CSIP. In fact, the school-based planning and decision-making process can be undermined when principals appoint their own members instead of holding elections for CSIP positions. In the schools visited, those where staff did not resent their CAR designation were more likely to have principals who supported CSIP. Principals and CSIP chairpersons whose reports to Central focused most strongly on outside factors that damaged the school's progress generally had the fewest "major accomplishments" to report.

Thirty percent of principals interviewed in the OEA study felt CSIP was an intrusion into regular teaching practices, and only one-third noted that they felt CSIP was an effective way to improve the school. However, according to OEA, "all initially apprehensive committee members came to recognize CSIP as a unified approach and an effective collaborative method to improve student

achievement." Of the CSIP facilitators who were asked to list program weaknesses, however, 31 percent were concerned about the principals' lack of interest and support. Mr. Clarke hopes that principals will become increasingly sympathetic to CSIP, through new leadership development efforts for them at the Center for Educational Leadership, the CSA, and at Brooklyn and City Colleges.

High turnover of both principals and district facilitators has hurt the continuity of the CSIP programs in the schools. The facilitator at School A listed turnover as one of the causes of that CSIP Committee's insecurity and slowness. Seven of the 31 (23%) of the facilitators left their positions after the first year of the program. Turnover will be an ongoing problem, as 200 of the system's principals are slated to retire in the next five years.

Another shortcoming of the CSIP process is that, by definition, one person is not responsible for its success. When asked who was accountable for the implementation of a school's plan, Mr. Clarke acknowledged it was a good question. He said everyone from the Chancellor down to the committee was responsible, and the principal had the burden of ensuring a school's goals were fulfilled. The district superintendent, he added, must sign off on all plans, and bears some responsibility. Clearly, when a process is ruled by a committee, it is more difficult to place credit or blame on one individual. However, in the OEA study, principals interviewed said they felt "CSIP increased their responsibilities by necessitating more meetings and making them accountable for the plan's success."

2. Climate of Expectation

In a paper prepared for the Board of Education, Professor Ron Edmonds discussed results of a state comparison of two New York City public schools serving analogous poor populations.

> "...many professional personnel in the less effective school attributed childrens' reading problems to non-school factors and were pessimistic about their ability to have an impact, creating an environment in which children failed because they were not expected to succeed. However, in the more effective school, teachers were less skeptical about their ability to have an impact on children."

Many of the staff interviewed for this study did not expect their students to succeed. Instead, they tried to make excuses for their CAR designation -- they were listed only because of high teacher turnover in one third grade class, they made the list because of a .5 difference in one score, they weren't a Chapter I school so how could their improvement efforts succeed? Several cited their students as major problems, so beset by socioeconomic problems that it was almost impossible for them to learn. "Fifty percent of our students are at reading level, although we have a problem with poor reading achievement," the principal of School C said. "The problems with the rest are not in our control. They have the same teachers, the same programs as those who are achieving. You can't attribute all their problems to the school if half the school is achieving with the same teachers." He did not look beyond the status quo to remedy the unmet needs of his poorer-performing students.

Many school staff see CSIP as a threatening affront to the status quo, instead of a challenge toward future growth. Many

principals and teachers have lowered expectations, which are further decreased when their schools are singled out on the CAR list.

Staff at too many of the visited schools spent a great deal of energy explaining why they had been designated as in need of improvement, when in fact it should be a consistent policy in every building that programs could and should be improved on an ongoing basis. All schools in the city are in need of improvement. By singling out certain ones on a published list, the program engenders resentment of the required school improvement process.

Four of the seven visited schools reported resentment about their CAR designations, and staff at both schools with unsupportive principals had expressed resentment about appearing on the list. "It's not fair for us to be compared to schools in the suburbs, where conditions are very different," the principal of school C said. Often schools complained about their CAR designation to the detriment of school improvement. School G, for example, felt its designation was unfair, and its CSIP committee disbanded after a year.

"It's a problem that school improvement has been associated with schools associated with having trouble with achievement," according to Mr. Clarke. He said the state was moving toward defining all schools as in need of improvement, although regulating this could be detrimental. "When you require something, people see it as an imposition, and people can sabotage it." He added that monitoring costs can take away resources from implementing the program itself.

To obviate the problem of stigma and low expectations, some districts, including Districts 1 and 7, have required all of their schools to participate in CSIP, whether or not they were on the CAR list. Districts 22 and 32 are also moving in this direction, according to Mr. Clarke. The High School Division has mandated that every school participate in CSIP, asking staff at all high schools to expect more from their schools, themselves and their students. In District 1 schools, for example, each school has a Concerned Educator Staff Development Committee, to foster school-based planning, regardless of their CAR designation. Not all districts are so cooperative. Of 18 district level staff development officials the Panel surveyed for another research report, six reported that CSIP schools receive no extra help from the district, and only four said school-based staff developers worked in CAR schools. One official said there were no CAR schools in his district, which actually had the largest number of them in the city.

It must be stressed, however, that increased expectations alone cannot improve a school. Simply requiring optimism from a staff in need of revitalization can actually damage morale: the same, familiar group of people meeting to discuss the same, familiar problems will not create change unless something new is added to the equation. All schools, including those officially designated as in need of improvement, need staff development about instructional issues, how to restructure programs, and reallocations of funds and staff time.

3. Atmosphere Conducive to Instruction

The schools visited were a far cry from becoming, in Mr. Edmonds' words, "orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive,

and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand." Overcrowded buildings, insufficient time for meetings, and staff shortages were largely responsible for the chaotic conditions in some of the schools visited, where, for example, four classes met regularly in the gym. Often, these conditions were out of the school's control. Overcrowding in a school shortens lunch periods and allows for less time for teachers to meet. This was corroborated by the OEA study, which found half of the committee members wanted release time for more meetings during the regular school day, or compensation for more meetings after school. District 1 has helped overcome this problem by arranging for a common monthly prep for two hours, allowing CSIP chairs and district staff developers to meet together, individually or in groups. The District Superintendent provided funding for freeing up these periods. The principal at School D suggested pooling the staff's CSIP stipends to hire replacement teachers to provide coverage during meetings, but this good idea was not implemented.

The need for funds to reduce school overcrowding has many ramifications and few easy solutions. While it has not been proven that lack of space in the school building causes poor student performance, the Panel's interviews illustrate how overcrowding is an obstacle to school improvement. In packed schools such as Schools B, C, D, F and G, lack of space can reduce the length of lunch periods, giving teachers fewer opportunities for faculty meetings. Overcrowded schools are unable to implement the basic programs designed to foster improvements citywide, such as capped class size, new classes for LEP and special education students,

increased guidance, and more school libraries. School overcrowding is not only an inconvenience and detrimental to school tone; it also has programmatic implications.

In schools with staff shortages, it is especially difficult to find staff to provide coverage for teachers while they attend committee meetings. School E, which still had a vacant teaching position as of May 1, was unable to identify coverage teachers. The EPP's research has shown that inexperienced teachers are most likely to be assigned to the most challenging schools, those with low reading scores and high staff turnover rates, in poor neighborhoods. These hard-to-staff schools are ones most likely to experience staff shortages later into the academic year. The resulting vacancies, paired with high staff turnover, make a consistent school improvement process unnecessarily difficult.

According to an article by Stewart Purkey and Marshall Smith in the 1983 Elementary School Journal, "Once a school experiences success, keeping the staff together seems to maintain, and promote further, success. Frequent transfers are destructive and likely to retard, if not prevent, the growth of a coherent and ongoing school personality." These factors make instructional planning more difficult.

In addition, according to Mr. Hamer, conflicts often arise in school-based planning, without cooperation between staff members responsible for special and bilingual education, health-related curriculum and substance abuse. Curriculum planning has often been too far removed from school improvement efforts, except in the schools with the most effective CSIP committees. Planning for Chapter I and other compensatory programs often takes place in

isolation. There has been some effort on the state level to address this problem, and federal regulations have now required integrated planning. At the schools the Panel visited, five out of seven had special ed teachers on their committees, while three included ESL teachers and none said they had bilingual staff represented. (See Appendix D.)

B. How CSIP's Implementation was Inadequate

The New York City Board of Education, responsible for by far the largest number of CAR schools in the state, has not previously given adequate support to the Comprehensive School Improvement Program. Many of CSIP's failings, in fact, can be attributed to neglect from the Central Board. In areas such as staff development and other personnel issues, parent involvement, services to LEP students, and accountability, CSIP's shortcomings can be traced to 110 Livingston Street.

1. Staff Development

The confusion and apathy many staff members expressed about CSIP could have been avoided with adequate staff development. Teachers and principals at several visited schools clearly needed more training in the school improvement process. For example, staff at only three schools mentioned that facilitators were helpful in conducting staff development workshops or arranging them from the district. School G had a very poor understanding of what the process could offer, expecting significant financial assistance in implementing plans. Few schools were aware of what was available to them, for example, the $400 stipend all CAR schools receive,

regardless of whether or not they were assigned facilitators. School G also had uninformed expectations of how CSIP could be improved in that school--by adding library shelves. Adequate staff development would have been able to prevent these misconceptions. Some teachers have indicated that CSIP is a make-work exercise that produces large amounts of paperwork and small amounts of school improvement. While staff at five of the seven schools the Panel visited indicated that CSIP improved the level of collaboration among them, only 40 percent of the committee members OEA interviewed said that their teams were very supportive during the implementation process. One would expect school-based planning and decision-making, by definition, to improve the staff's ability to work together, but two of the schools visited reported either no increased collaboration or increases only for the CSIP Committee, while another principal only hesitantly admitted that the process had increased the level of collaboration in her school. This could be a result of inadequate training for CSIP, especially in management issues.

Training could also address the problem of high staff turnover among CSIP participants. More than half of the schools visited for this study had worked with more than one principal, facilitator, or CSIP chair over the past two years, with School G going through two facilitators, a principal, and a coordinator. School A had vacancies in all three positions during their school improvement process. These changes greatly impede CSIP, as staff members have to spend significant amounts of time becoming oriented to the process and the personalities involved in it.

OEA found that 75 percent of CSIP committee members had received no formal workshops from the central CSIP office to prepare them for their responsibilities. Only 45 percent of the staff attended any CSIP workshops held centrally. When asked if the implementation stage of their school improvement plan had changed their usual teaching styles and focus on student needs, only half said that it had, by helping them set goals, improve writing instruction, and use different patterns for grouping students. Of the teachers OEA surveyed, 78 percent said they wanted more staff development and assistance from the central CSIP staff. The report found that "teachers wanted more formal meetings and workshops on how to implement the school improvement process in their individual classrooms." There was a serious dearth of staff development programs from either community school districts or headquarters on how to address special student populations, on curriculum improvements, on model programs applicable to CSIP schools, and on reallocating time and funds. These are issues that are in many cases completely outside the expertise of teachers and staff at a floundering school.

2. Staffing

CSIP schools often found it difficult to attract staff, with one school reporting a vacancy late into the school year. The Department of Human Resources has not been able to encourage experienced staff to at-risk schools. Consequently, these schools have suffered high turnover rates that endanger the continuity of school-based planning. In all but two of the seven schools visited, more than 30 percent of the staff were temporary per diem or probationary teachers indicating high turnover. In one school over half the teachers fell into this category.

Facilitator positions have also suffered very high turnover rates, which also impedes the planning process. Staff shortages have made it particularly difficult to arrange for teacher coverage for CSIP Committee meetings. CSIP facilitators have not been particularly helpful in advising school staff on how to arrange staff schedules for common periods.

3. Parents

Parent involvement in the schools visited was uneven, with some schools having more than the designated two parent representatives regularly attending meetings. Only four of the seven visited schools have successfully encouraged consistent parent involvement on their CSIP committees. School B, for example, originally had three parent representatives, but two of them were not replaced when their children graduated from the school. In School A, on the other hand, two mothers became so involved in the school through CSIP that they began working there as paras. In the OEA report, parents indicated they would like more workshops for themselves and for other parents. Several schools noted that parents cannot attend meetings early in the morning, late in the afternoon, or during lunch, the common times for committee meetings.

A parent at one school spoke about how parents and teachers have developed much more trust through working together in CSIP. This trust helped result in a homework training program, so parents are now better equipped to help their children with schoolwork. This is an example of CSIP directly improving services to children. Test scores at this school have risen consistently.

4. Limited English Proficient Students

According to Mr. Clarke, the State Education Department's bilingual office saw through its own initiatives that CSIP was not addressing the needs of limited English proficient (LEP) students. A mandated statewide conference addressed this issue in April, 1988. Through it facilitators and CSIP administrators discovered that more data about these students must be collected and analyzed, and that staff must know the number of years a student's family has been in the United States, as well as his or her home language in order to provide appropriate services. Resources must be distributed according to these needs. As a result of the conference, every school's CSIP plan must now be amended to address the needs of LEP students next year. A similar new requirement will also go into effect regarding special education students.

In the schools the Panel visited, no CSIP committee members were identified as bilingual teachers, even though the percentage of students who were LEP was much higher than the citywide average, with the exception of one school. There is a need for coordination between the CSIP planning process and groups in the school that plan services for special populations, including LEP students, those who live in temporary housing and those with handicapping conditions. CSIP committees must be more representative of the teaching staff as a whole.

Three of the seven schools visited were out of compliance with the ASPIRA Consent Decree. Particularly in the earlier grades, there were sufficient numbers of students speaking the same language to form bilingual classes. If staff is not available to cover these classes,

entitled students should then be assigned to ESL classes, although this was clearly not being done, according to the Board's figures from 1986-87. In addition, the figures show that special education LEP students receive even poorer service than their regular education LEP peers. The Panel reported the most flagrant of these to the Office of Bilingual Education.

5. Accountability

According to the EPP's recent Accountability Statement, "Accountability must be seen as a comprehensive process that includes goal-setting, authority, implementation, assessment, and oversight." While the CSIP process, by definition, encourages goal-setting and assessment of each designated school's current status, it does not provide resources to put that planning and knowledge into practice.

6. Testing

The Panel's statement also defined accountability as "an assurance that those with responsibility deliver the necessary services that will lead to specific student outcomes." First of all, in the current structure, the direct lines of accountability are not clear from the school level up to the Chancellor's office. Second, the outcomes CAR schools are working to achieve are improved test scores, to remove themselves from the list. Unfortunately, there is a striking discrepancy between the problems used as indicators for CAR eligibility and problems the staff identifies as the school's most serious. Most frequently noted were lack of space, insufficient time for teachers to meet during the school day, a lack of funds to pay for substitute coverage, and staff shortages

in general. The program will benefit from quantitative and qualitative measures of student and staff performance, and these benchmarks must be valid and relevant. Finally, relying on short-term changes in test scores will often pervert a program's design and obscure its long-term impact and more profound developments. Learning is a complicated and long-term process. The results of instructional changes may not appear quickly.

In many schools, the program has not resulted in significant change of the way things are done on the school level. While some schools have arranged for more common periods and faculty meetings, and others have increased staff development offerings through their facilitators, it is difficult to attribute directly other changes in school operations directly to CSIP.

An accountable system has a series of rewards and sanctions for schools, programs, and staff that do not meet its goals. It is unacceptable for schools to consider it a sanction when they are designated as "in need of improvement." Every school needs improvement, regardless of its test scores, attendance, or socioeconomic status. There are no sanctions for schools that do not actively participate in planning and implementing reform. School administrations that ignore CSIP retain the same power as those that devote a great deal of energy to school improvement. This latter group receives no meaningful rewards for its additional work. Currently, removal from the CAR list is the only official incentive for schools to excel in their school improvement programs. A program without meaningful incentives and sanctions will not meet its goals in an accountable fashion.

CSIP-1/1

7. Lack of Funding

According to Education Week's special issue on school improvement, "Many practitioners say that, at a minimum, small amounts of new or reallocated funds must be offered to send school staff members the message that the (school improvement) program is important and to provide them with resources they can use as they see fit for staff training and release time." Some experts have recommended allocating $50-$100 per student to implement school-based plans. This would amount to $30,750 to $155,500 for the schools the Panel visited. Under CSIP, however, they receive only $400 a year, unless they receive competitive grants from the state or private foundations.

Some schools perceived the scant funds for CSIP as a threatening message from the central administration, implying that schools should work harder and more efficiently with current levels of funding. Clearly, every school should be able to do a better job with available resources. Unless the state and city provide schools with the various kinds of support listed above, it is unlikely that schools will make significant progress. Without enhanced staff development and technical assistance, school-based planners will not succeed, no matter how many forms they fill out. They need to be exposed to new ideas and methods.

Mr. Clarke said the plan was to discourage schools from building into their plans the additional resources needed to implement them. It was a false premise, he said, that schools needed additional funds to improve. He admitted, however, that some schools didn't feel they could improve the school according to the CSIP procedures until they had basic instructional materials, like chalk. The CSIP

Committee could work with existing resources for staff development and new materials. For example, it should be the forum in decisions on the allocation of Basic School Staffing funds and other new initiatives. In the past, staff development about these funds has only reached district personnel, not school-level staff.

CSIP Decentralization

High schools were taken away from the jurisdiction of the central CSIP office in April, 1987 and put under the purview of the high school superintendents. At this time the CSIP office lost five positions.

The CSIP office has been decentralized as part of the major trimming of the Board of Education headquarters. OCSIP currently has a director, an assistant director, five borough coordinators, six staff developers, and six administrative personnel. All of the facilitators have been assigned directly to Community School District offices. OCSIP is currently developing a proposal for the Chancellor's approval, for its ongoing functions and budget.

Mr. Clarke felt decentralization may jeopardize the effectiveness and integrity of the program, he said, because facilitators will report directly to the district superintendents, who may expect them to take on responsibilities outside of their current job descriptions. For example, CSIP facilitators for the high schools are in some cases also full-time Chapter 53 screening coordinators, although they are responsible for 30 CAR schools. (The maximum load for CSIP district facilitators is five schools.) Mr. Clarke was concerned that as district employees the facilitators

may be seen as less neutral and more evaluative, more likely to communicate with the superintendent about personnel issues.

On the other hand, decentralization of OCSIP will bring technical assistance closer to the school building level, where improvement is to take place. According to Mr. Hamer, "The new Chancellor has done a bold and important thing by decentralizing CSIP to bring it closer to the schools and students. Any new relations as they develop will be an improvement. School improvement should be at the building level, and external agents and facilitators should be close to the building and know it as intimately as possible. Decentralization of CSIP is a win-win situation, and it would be hard to sour it unless you encounter recalcitrant principals." He said that principals and district superintendents who don't like CSIP could damage the effectiveness of the decentralized program, but can also do this under the centralized system, where superintendent and principal support of CSIP has varied widely.

Reallocation of Central Board functions can enhance the accountability of educational programs, by bringing their administrators closer to the school level. It will also encourage better coordination between CSIP and district and school planning and programs. District policies and resources will be more responsive to CSIP plans and school needs. If CAR schools are able to receive more tailored technical assistance from CSIP facilitators as part of a comprehensive response to school improvement, a decentralized system will make for more effective programs.

CSIP-1/1

NEXT STEPS

The State has not been clear about how schools will be removed from the CAR list, Mr. Clarke said. Mr. Hamer said schools are removed when they exceed the state reference point in all categories. He said some New York City schools would have been removed after meeting state criteria, except they did not meet the Chancellor's Minimum Standards, which were higher. The process of removal from the CAR list is currently being evaluated.

Mr. Hamer feels the future of the program is bright, given the federal government's inclusion of school improvement initiatives in the reauthorization of Chapter I, and state legislation to add permanent personnel, in New York City in particular, to the school improvement process.

The above research indicates that the success of school-based planning depends on more than providing incentives, sanctions, and funds. Successful school improvement requires the interaction of a variety of additional resources: accountable and cooperative administrators, well-trained teachers, active parents, equitable services, a viable school environment, and accurate gauges of success. Unless all of these ingredients are added, one cannot expect the recipe to succeed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Educational Priorities Panel has found several areas in need of change in the state-mandated school improvement program. First, there are fundamental system-wide changes that must occur before school improvements can reasonably be expected to succeed. These areas need change on the state level and, in many cases, require legislative action. Next, the structure of the Comprehensive School Improvement Program must be amended in several fundamental ways. Finally, the implementation of the program at the city level must be strengthened. Only then will school-based planning and improvements have a real chance for success.

A. Changes on the State Level

1. Equitable Funding -- The state legislature must amend the funding formula for state aid to education to reflect the percentage of students educated in New York City schools, and the proportion of students with special needs that the city serves.

2. School Buildings -- The state legislature must pass provisions for a New York City school building authority, to build new schools and make major renovations on the existing structures. This new entity would make way for the Board of Education to receive $600 million in MAC funds.

3. Teacher Licensing -- The Board of Examiners must be abolished. Teachers who wish to work in New York City should no longer be subjected to duplicative testing procedures. The state legislature must pass the bill currently before it that would make New York City's teacher testing procedures reflect those in the rest of the state.

B. Structure of CSIP

Administrative Leadership:

1. To alleviate the resentment and apathy some principals feel toward CSIP, the state and the central Board of Education must encourage all schools to undertake formal schoolbased planning and improvement procedures. This could help remove the stigma from CAR schools, as was done in the city's high schools. SED should pass

formal recommendations to this end immediately. Regardless, the Chancellor must require all city schools to complete school-based planning for school improvement, and each must implement these plans.

2. The Board of Education and SED should address the issue of high staff turnover on the CSIP Committees, particularly for facilitators, who serve as the program's linchpins. SED should study the need for higher salaries and more staff development for facilitators.

3. The Board of Education and SED should establish clear lines of accountability for members of CSIP Committees, so the principal will be directly responsible for the successful implementation of CSIP plans. The Board should develop and implement clear incentives and sanctions for principals. This would automatically encourage principals to become more involved and invested in school-based planning, and would draw clear lines of responsibility.

4. The Board of Education must draw clear lines of oversight from the school level to the Community School District and up to the Chancellor, so school staff will understand who is directly responsible for the program's success.

Developing a Climate of Expectations:

1. The Community School Districts and the Central Headquarters must provide better staff development to school staff around the issue of school improvement, so they can see how CSIP can help the school. Teachers and principals must understand the program's strengths and limitations, so they will have realistic expectations of its possible results. For example, staff and parents at poorer performing schools should be encouraged to visit schools where CSIP has brought about significant change. Staff should know that they may have a greater freedom to allocate funds if they create a successful school plan, and that failure to do so may result in their losing power over such matter. (see #5B).

Atmosphere Conducive to Instruction:

1. CSIP facilitators must give schools direct advice on scheduling common periods for teachers to meet. If, due to overcrowding or staff shortages, this is not possible, facilitators should advise staff on finding funds in the school's budget or from other sources to provide coverage so teachers could attend meetings.

2. Facilitators must also ensure that a school's CSIP Committee reflects all the groups responsible for curriculum, especially bilingual and special education planners. Curricular planning must be carefully coordinated to ensure that instructional improvements reach all students.

C. Implementation of CSIP

1. Staff Development:

a) The central administration and community school districts should provide more comprehensive, ongoing training in the school improvement process for facilitators, principals, teachers, and parents as a primary component of all ongoing staff development programs. Staff and parents must be trained in what they can expect from CSIP, what it can and cannot provide them. They must be instructed in developing plans that are more closely linked to student performance and specific goals.

b) Facilitators must receive more staff development. They will thus be better equipped for their jobs and more likely to stay in them, reducing the serious problem of high staff turnover.

c) The new Office of Professional Development should focus on remediation and special populations during the mandated pre-service and in-service training for new teachers. Current staff development is insufficient to prepare new teachers for work in CAR schools, where they are too frequently sent, where there is a great need for such services.

d) Pre-service training for teachers should include one full session on school-based planning. The Central Board should instruct school staff on integrating planning for categorical or specialized programs with the CSIP plan, to avoid duplication and confusion. Staff must also be trained so they will be prepared to help allocate Basic School Staffing funds. This technical assistance should prepare CSIP Committee members to be included in the allocation process.

e) Above and beyond pre-service training, facilitators must inform school staffs about all Board-run and independent staff development programs available to them. The CSIP regulations should require staff at each school to review existing staff development services and curriculum, to see if they meet the school's needs. The CSIP Committee must be required to assess and incorporate the school's mentor program and staff development programs supported by Basic School Staffing funds.

f) Facilitators must be trained to instruct schools in implementing the Local School Option, a provision of the latest United Federation of Teachers contract that allows changes in school regulations and some contract provisions if the principal and 75 percent of the teaching staff agree to them.

2. Staffing:

a) The Department of Human Resources must work to attract a large number of qualified teachers, particularly those who are interested in working in challenging schools. It is inexcusable that at-risk schools still have vacancies at the beginning of May. The Department should make a special effort to encourage qualified teachers to work in more challenging schools, by providing new teachers with the opportunity to meet with veterans of at-risk schools, who could discuss the rewards of their work. Specific recruitment efforts in this vein include priority rankings for staffing at-risk schools, and non-financial incentives such as parking privileges, on-site daycare, and paid internships to college students interested in working in troubled schools.

b) Teachers also need more time to meet together for school-based planning and for the chance to discuss the needs of particular students or classes. CSIP facilitators should be responsible for advising staff on how best to arrange common periods. As another incentive, the state should provide schools with active CSIP committees with funds for substitute coverage, if they are having trouble meeting during the day.

c) The high turnover rate among facilitators must be studied and addressed, through providing them with more staff development and other benefits and incentives for staying on the job.

d) Teacher and parent members should be elected to the CSIP committee by their peers, to ensure that they are representative of the school as a whole.

3. Parents:

a) Schools must work consistently to maintain parent involvement in CSIP. If a parent's child graduates from the school, the CSIP Committee should replace the parent representative immediately.

b) Schools should rotate the times of CSIP Committee meetings from before school, during school, after hours, and evenings, so parents who are unable to attend when their children need care can still participate in school-based planning.

4. LEP Students:

a) The Board of Education must, at a minimum, meet its legal mandates to limited English proficient students. This should be self-evident, close to a dozen years after the Aspira Consent Decree. Almost half of the schools the Panel visited were out of compliance with the law. This severely hinders the education of a large percentage of the system's students, and must be addressed immediately.

b) Principals and CSIP facilitators must ensure that CSIP represents staff involved in planning services to LEP students, as well as those working with other special populations.

c) Finally, the Board of Education must continue to enhance its database on the specific needs of LEP students.

5. Accountability:

a) The Chancellor should determine who, above the building principal, is directly accountable for the successful implementation of CSIP plans. He should designate this as a responsibility of a deputy chancellor and clearly delineate who at the district level is responsible for CSIP's continued progress after OCSIP's decentralization.

b) In schools with staffs that are unable to adopt an acceptable CSIP plan or that do not show significant improvement, the Central Board must provide more technical assistance and resources. If after a year of this help, the school staff is uncooperative and unable to plan school-based improvements, the school cannot be left to fail. In this case, staff must relinquish their planning authority to the Community School District and, if this proves insufficient after another year, to the Central Board. Likewise, the State should waive categorical funding constraints for schools with CSIP committees that create and implement effective plans (as judged by objective criteria, to be developed). This will create an effective system of incentives and sanctions for schools to improve.

6. Testing:

a) Both the State Education Department and the Board of Education should adopt performance indicators in addition to standardized tests for designating CAR schools. These should include teacher performance, parent satisfaction with the school, and its ability to serve students with special needs. Staff perceptions of the school environment should be used as one measure of success of school-based planning efforts. SED should amend the school improvement process to require that all staff are given the formal opportunity to rate progress in their school toward each objective they have identified. Parents must also have input into the measures of school effectiveness. Unlike current standards, the new criteria should not encourage staff to teach to the tests, and should aim for results that are more concrete and dependable than rising scores. The Chancellor's Commission on Minimum Standards should develop local criteria that can be used regardless of state action.

b) The Office of Educational Assessment should assess the use of standardized tests, to determine what skills are tested, how efficiently tests are administered, how results are used in the school improvement process, and if better measures of skills acquisition are available.

c) In the high schools, the Division should ensure that tests are given uniformly, with each school testing students at the same time in the school year, to ensure that results will be comparable.

7. Funding

a) The Board of Education must provide more discretionary funds to the schools, giving CSIP Committees the flexibility and freedom to allocate funds to priorities they have identified. Without this power to implement their plans, planning committees are like children in a candy store, without a dime. Mandating improvements without providing needed resources only encourages staff cynicism and inaction.

b) One of the primary roles of the facilitator should be to advise schools about internal budget reallocations and how to use funds from other city-wide budget initiatives such as Project Child and Basic School Staffing to further CSIP goals. The CSIP office must ensure that facilitators are trained to distinguish between supplemental and operating funds, to monitor allocations and be sure that schools have not used categoricals to supplant operating funds.

8. CSIP Decentralization -- OCSIP's decentralization must be monitored, to ensure that school-based planning continues and that the facilitators are working only on CSIP-related activities.

Appendix A

Excerpt from Section 100.2 of the Commissioner's Regulations

(m) Comprehensive assessment report. By October 31 of each year, the State Education Department will submit to each school district and to each nonpublic school State test results for their respective comprehensive assessment reports. On or before December 15 of each year, the superintendent of each school district shall submit the comprehensive assessment report to the board of education of such district at a public meeting.

(1) The comprehensive assessment report for each school district and nonpublic school will include the following information, for each school building and each school district, for the three school years immediately preceding the school year in which the report is issued:

(i) Student test data on all pupil evaluation program tests, all Regents preliminary competency tests, all Regents competency tests, all program evaluation tests, all Regents examinations, all occupational education proficiency examinations and all second language proficiency examinations as defined in this Part;

(ii) Student enrollment by grade;

(iii) Student dropout and attendance rates for public schools;

(iv) Number of students transferred into the alternative high school equivalency preparation program as set forth in section 100.7(e) of this Part;

(v) Data, as required by the commissioner, on diplomas and certificates awarded;

(vi) Any additional information prescribed by the commissioner on educational equity and other issues; and

(vii) Any additional information which the superintendent of the school district or the chief administrative officer of the nonpublic school believes will reflect the relative assessment of a school building or district.

(2) Each board of education through the superintendent and in cooperation with the professional staff, and for nonpublic schools, the chief administrative officer of the school, shall initiate measures designed to improve results related to their respective comprehensive assessment reports.

(3) On or before October 31 of each year, the commissioner shall identify the school buildings most in need of assistance based on the items set forth in paragraph (1) of this subdivision. A comprehensive school improvement plan shall be developed for each school building pursuant to subparagraph (i) of this paragraph, and shall address the areas in which the school has been determined to be in need of assistance.

(i) The comprehensive school improvement plan shall be developed in consultation with teachers, administrators, other school service professionals, students and parents, and shall be:

(a) in a format prescribed by the commissioner, including any changes in a school's program or procedures required by the commissioner;

(b) developed in cooperation with department staff or other persons assigned to assist the school in the development of the comprehensive school improvement program;

(c) approved by the board of education of the school district, or for nonpublic schools, the chief administrative officer of the school; and

(d) submitted to the department no later than April 30 of the school year in which the commissioner required such a plan.

(ii) The comprehensive school improvement plan shall be implemented no later than the September following the close of the school year in which the plan was approved by the commissioner.

Appendix B

CSIP DATA

School	Percent above State Reference Point on Degrees of Reading Power Test * % Reading at Grade Level 84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	Proportion of Students in Lowest Quartile Making Progress 1986-87	Percent above State Reference Point in Pupil Examination Program Test * 84-85	85-86	86-87	Attendance * 84-85	85-86	86-87
A					58.3				86.8	86.0	83.4
grade 3	42.7	59.0	60.3			40.0	67.1	74.2			
grade 6	72.3	74.2	59.7			65.2	80.4	58.1			
Schoolwide			53.8	62.2							
B					48.8				88.5	88.3	89.9
grade 3	46.4	50.5	52.5			60.0	74.4	76.1			
grade 6	54.5	57.8	55.9			59.3	76.8	60.7			
Schoolwide			51.9	53.3							
C					61.0				86.5	84.2	83.2
grade 3	42.3	50.0	42.5			43.6	56.7	47.8			
grade 6	-	-	-			-	-	-			
Schoolwide			46.7	45.0							
D					52.2				87.0	86.1	86.8
grade 3	45.3	54.0	65.8			53.8	58.6	81.5			
grade 6	53.0	50.5	59.8			60.5	50.0	57.8			
Schoolwide			58.6	64.1							
E					53.8				84.2	85.2	84.3
grade 3	35.8	54.0	77.4			53.1	67.2	88.0			
grade 6	62.1	65.6	62.5			48.4	70.0	68.8			
Schoolwide			60.8	67.1							
F					53.8				91.8	90.4	90.4
grade 3	52.6	54.2	67.3			46.1	63.6	66.7			
grade 6	64.3	67.5	74.1			73.0	62.4	69.0			
Schoolwide			65.7	65.6							
G					n/a				91.1	90.6	90.1
grade 3	58.5	66.7	70.4			54.6	67.9	83.2			
grade 6	62.1	73.8	65.2			48.0	59.8	74.0			
Schoolwide			69.2	64.9							

* Source = School Profiles

School	Register/ Utilization * 84-85	85-86	86-87	Percent LEP Students* 84-85	85-86	86-87	Chapter I Eligibility*	Percentage of Probationary or Full-Time Substitutes in the Teaching Staff
A				26.8	24.0	18.7	yes	8
register	691	687	748					
utilization	69	79	83					
B				47.9	52.0	43.6	yes	35
register	1,486	1,524	1,555					
utilization	130	152	137					
C				31.0	24.3	20.6	yes	35
register	770	883	939					
utilization	121	137	149					
D				19.4	20.1	16.4	yes	35
register	1,136	1,157	1,210					
utilization	159	195	232					
E				21.0	21.8	13.4	yes	54
register	615	622	664					
utilization	56	63	68					
F				8.6	8.4	8.1	yes	30
register	1,254	1,311	1,316					
utilization	147	164	167					
G				13.5	11.9	11.5	no	11
register	760	797	794					
utilization	95	103	111					

School	LEP Student Participation as of October 31, 1986				Years of Involvement with Central CSIP Office	Active Parent Involvement	Racial Breakdown, 1986-87			
	# Students Entitled	# Full Program	# Partial Program	# ESL Only			Asian	Hispanic	Black	White
Citywide	80,202	42,408		32,721	-		6.6	33.9	38.1	21.
A	137	0	17	41	1	2 regularly attend	5.7	61.5	21.9	10.
B	678	467	52	35	1	1	1.7	88.9	5.3	3.
C	193	159	2	0	0	1 attends seldom	.1	62.9	36.7	.
D	199	35	0	73	1	2	10.6	57.0	25.2	7.
E	89	5	3	16	2	2 parents, irregular attendance	.3	56.9	42.6	.
F	107	0	0	100	0	3 consistent & others	.2	10.9	88.6	.
G	88	0	0	15	0	1 consistent	18.9	42.2	21.8	17.1

School	Need More Time	Resentment about CAR Designation?	Principal Support	Increased Collaboration Reported	Recent Turnover? Principal Facilitator CSIP Chair	Meets Original Standards? as of?	New Staff Development Attributed to CSIP
A	yes	yes	n/a	yes	yes, prin., facil., coord.	yes/shortly after designation	yes
B	no	no	yes	yes	facilitator	yes/ 2nd year	yes
C	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes
D	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no
E	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes
F	no	no	yes	no, just for committee	new principal & chair	no	n/a
G	no	yes	no	hesitant yes	facil.(2x) coord., prin.	yes/ spring 87	no

Appendix C

SCHOOL A

CSIP

We were able to visit School A's CSIP Committee meeting, where the Central Board facilitator, instructed the members to mark each of the school's goals as Completed, Ongoing, Delete, and Revisions, according to progress made on the school's CSIP plan. This was part of the state-required paperwork, and was probably not the best use of the Committee's lunch hour. Staff members broke up into small groups to discuss this, but spent more time talking about possible solutions to the school's problems than they did on the letter ratings. They seemed congenial. They then had to "debrief" by going around the table and saying something positive about the day's meeting, which was a bit much.

The school first appeared on the CAR list in 1985 because of its sixth grade reading and math scores. School staff felt very insulted by this designation. Another serious problem is attendance, due mostly to the large number (112 out of a student body of 740) of students who live in temporary housing. Their attendance rates are kept separately, so as not to penalize the school as a whole. This is a common practice but discriminates against these students by allowing the school to segregate and perhaps disregard their attendance problems.

Although the school met the standards shortly after appearing on the list, it must continue its CSIP process for three years. The Committee has met 28 times so far. The plan is being revised annually until 1989. The facilitator with 4 other schools in the district, spending a day a week in each one. She spoke highly of School A's program, although she mentioned that the staff is less confident, due to turnover--a new principal, a new board facilitator, and a new CSIP coordinator. The CSIP coordinator said the process has encouraged networking among teachers, as each Committee member brings back information to his or her grade and floor and speaks at grade and staff conferences. Morale is up and consciousness has been raised. Planning takes place more often than just during the lunch hour.

As a result of CSIP, the Committee representatives said they have a Project ALERT (Acquiring Language Enhances Reading, writing and Thinking) person in from the district twice a week, to work with five self-selected teachers about whole language acquisition and the writing process. Tax levy and district funds have supported new computer software, in line with CSIP's goals. The school has a new behavior code, and students on the honor roll wear buttons. A new sustained silent reading program has also been successful. Committee members mentioned that special education teachers are talking to regular staff about mainstreaming as a result of CSIP's motion toward "congruence," a new word for mainstreaming (also applied to LEP students.) CSIP and the new teachers contract have had a positive effect on teacher input.

The school would like to have more staff to meet its CSIP goals, but it needs more funding. It would also like to meet with the Board representative more than once a week, more free time to meet, and additional training.

Parent Involvement

Parents are well represented on the CSIP committee, with two regularly attending since last year. This year they decided to become paras in the school, in part as a result of their involvement with CSIP. Parents are involved in every CSIP subcommittee, and they network with other parents too. The Parent Association is active, maintaining a parents' room, fundraising, volunteering with the students, and helping in the lunchroom. There is also a community association to work with the hotels, to encourage parents there to become involved with the life of the school. The school has hosted a math workshop for parents, teaching them to make manipulatives to help them teach their children at home.

Staff Development

Teachers have had sessions on classroom management, CLOZE reading power tests, test preparation, and for new teachers, record-keeping. Teachers list their needs with their preferences, and choose five topics to learn about during their inservice half-days. The next staff development session will cover science and writing. Teachers can also arrange to have common prep periods. The women we spoke to didn't know who their district representative was in charge of staff development. The facilitator said her central CSIP office had been in charge of most of the school's staff development.

The school has decided to buy new textbooks in science, and hopes to receive staff development from Houghton Mifflin with them. Next year it plans to buy math textbooks from the same company.

Services to LEP Students

A later phonecall to the principal revealed that the school has 102 LEP students entitled under the Consent Decree, with 0 receiving full services, 17 receiving partial, and 24 with ESL. A total of 137 students are entitled, with 41 total receiving ESL. We spoke to the principal about how parents are informed of available services to LEP students. He said a letter to parents goes out at the beginning of the year, in both English and Spanish. The letter asks parents to come in to meet with the ESL teacher. "Not that many come in," he said, as most work. If the parents don't come in, they usually send the letter back to the school, indicating the services they want the student to receive.

If the parent doesn't send anything back, "it depends, for the most part the students go to bilingual education, unless we think regular education would be better." Parents don't usually want their kids to transfer schools, he said, even if it meant receiving

a full program. Unfortunately, a bilingual class is available only to first and second graders. He said if there were enough students to form another class, he would form one, if he had enough space. Although the school is only operating at approximately 76 percent capacity, the principal feels there is not enough space to form a new class. The administrative assistant we met with also believed the school utilization rates were outdated.

The school is clearly out of compliance with the legal mandates. The letter should not require parents to request LEP services, and more classes should be available for an entitled population of that size. We have spoken to the Office of Bilingual Education about the above issues.

The school is planning to select a class of gifted and talented LEP students so parents will not feel there is a stigma around such bilingual classes.

The ESL program is a pullout program, and there is only one class, because of demand. There is one fully licensed bilingual teacher, one ESL teacher and one para. (There used to be more paras.) No new classes have been added this year.

Spanish as a Second Language is offered to fourth, fifth and sixth graders two or three times a week.

Special Programs

The school will be receiving a three-year $50,000 grant from the New York Times Foundation for its kindergarten and science programs.

From 1-1:20 every day is Read Aloud time, with teachers or students reading to every class. A "Parent Honor Roll" hangs on the wall, listing every parent, guardian, or older sibling who reads to a student.

There is a pullout reading program for homeless kids, as well as an afterschool program where they play with other students.

Given the school's changing neighborhood and the number of luxury high rises going up nearby, the school plans to open a Talented and Gifted program to encourage more students to attend.

SCHOOL B

CSIP

School B was designated as a CAR school the first year of the report, 1985. None of the staff was surprised or particularly disturbed by the rating, as the principal predicted it. Only two schools in its district aren't CAR schools.

The Committee, composed according to state regulations, has focused on students reading below grade level and those who need bilingual or ESL services. The principal believes that if the CAR list had been reissued in the second year, his school would not be on it, due to the significant improvement in students reading on grade level (36 percent in 1984, 51 percent in 1985, and 52 percent last year). The school is aiming to meet the Chancellor's Minimum Standards, however, and these require 64 percent of the students read at grade level. The principal attributes the past gains to the CSIP process.

Committee members were trained at the district office and completed a needs assessment with district assistance. The Central Board then analyzed (and lost) the assessment. Central assigned two facilitators to the district. At first the principal borrowed one from another school, as School B did not receive one. Meeting twice a month, the Committee took until March to develop the plan. The next year it had to revise its objectives, so the process was slow. Subcommittees formed and met during the day, more often than the full group, which met monthly. One of the subcommittees of teachers is analyzing the CSIP plan and rewriting it to address LEP student needs. However, according to the list of staff members it submitted to OCSIP, the school had no ESL or bilingual staff on its CSIP Committee.

The CSIP meetings have included a great deal of brainstorming by concerned staff members, not just those on the Committee. Meeting times and minutes were posted on the bulletin board right outside the main office. The Committee targeted three of the school's major problems: school environment, curriculum and instruction, and leadership and organization. (CAR identified attendance as a major problem, but last year the school met its goals, with over 91 percent attendance. The improvement was due to monitoring, sending letters, and telephone calls home. The school also gives perfect attendance awards and monthly attendance banners to the classes with the best attendance in each grade.)

The principal attributed some of the students' reading improvement to the district-wide "Golden Hour," silent reading from 9:00-10:15. Every teacher and para works with small groups of children who are all reading at the same level. There are no interruptions and no prep periods during this time.

The school also has 10 bilingual transitional classes, approximately two per grade, serving 280-300 students. In these classes the teacher may be bilingual or have a para who is. A school-based ESL trainer provides staff development to all the school's teachers who want it (currently, 12).

Parent Involvement

Originally three parents sat on the Committee, but the children of two have graduated, so only one remains. Parents are very actively involved in the school in general, attending workshops at night or orientation to the CSIP process, meeting with teachers about homework and the curriculum, as well as coming to parent-teacher conferences and open school week. An all-day parent conference, with 12 workshops, attracted 200 parents and 40 staff people. The community donated door prizes for this event. The Parents Association funded the journals for the Writing to Read program and gave a candlelit, catered dinner for Teacher Appreciation Night. They also provide funds to help students apply to attend private schools.

Other CSIP plans, such as a parenting center with workshops and classes for parents, were dropped due to lack of space, the reason the school could not get an SBST team, another need the Committee identified.

Funds

After consultation with the CSIP Committee, the UFT, and parents, the principal distributed Basic School Staffing funds for a bilingual guidance counselor, and a Writing to Read teacher (both of whom we met with, as they chair the CSIP Committee) and extra aide hours. State funds also helped fund the CSIP plan. A $5,000 grant provided books for the kindergarten and first grade, and an $18,000 grant for LEP services allowed the school to provide ESL training to all staff, as well as free afterschool Spanish classes for any interested teachers. School B also holds an afterschool remedial program for LEP students four days a week, with ESL, Math, and Spanish Reading.

The principal found these funds very helpful, more so than categoricals. He believes early childhood programs are very important for the students. Previously, the school had only one monolingual guidance counselor for over 1400 children. The aide hours are used to distribute the Ginn basic readers, which were adopted district-wide to help a student body with a high mobility rate adjust when moving from school to school or class to class.

(Since the school was capped this year and new students and those who had not registered before June 29 must be bused to another district, the principal has found a much lower mobility rate among his students. Their parents know that if they move even within the district, they will no longer be able to attend district schools.)

Staff Development

The CSIP process has instituted a huge staff development program, particularly in ESL and math. The district has also provided a communications arts program, and all Chapter I teachers are teacher trainers, doing staff development for eight periods a week, with one per grade. The school also has a math trainer working with a para in the Math Lab, which hosts a pullout program.

Programs for funded teachers take place during the school day, when they meet with the school-based trainers. Three times a month the school provides training on a topic such as ESL, during each lunch period, so everyone can attend. The school has afterschool workshops for those who want them, and the district provides some on Saturdays.

The state mentor program is also in effect. The principal finds that ten percent of his teachers are new to the school each year, and if they do well their first year, most stay on to get their licenses. Out of 25 TPDs, one or two aren't rehired each year.

Writing to Read

The school uses this IBM program to teach its kindergarten and first grade students to read. Five monolingual classes use the computers each day, and the principal has encouraged teachers of transitional classes to teach the computer commands so they can use the program too. Students learn phonics, keep a work journal, and can get printouts from the word processor. They make their own words using felt or magnetic letters, and listen to stories read aloud, with the first graders writing their own. The teacher was extremely enthusiastic about the program.

Physical Plant

The Writing to Read computer room was secured, and one room has been subdivided, since School B appeared on the CAR list. The Scorecard people have visited the building four times, but the principal has received no report from them. The school has not received any MAC maintenance funds, nor any of the district's handyman money.

Current needs include repair of the fence around the building. Work orders have been piling up for years, but the broken fence still poses a real threat to student safety. The school sign has been vandalized, many window shades are missing, only one water fountain works in the annex, and broken windows are repaired shoddily. The expansion of the library has been postponed for the past three years. The librarian wants to institute a multi-media center, and, especially after recent acquisitions, has very little space.

SCHOOL C

CSIP

The principal explained that the school was in its second year of the CSIP process. It was designated a CAR school primarily because of its poor reading scores and students' deficient writing skills. He had mixed emotions about CSIP. In his preface to the school's CSIP plan, he attributed the school's problems to outside factors: "Schools from affluent/middle class areas were compared with urban schools. Preschool education (birth to first grade) of both parents and children is a major variable which must be addressed....The time, effort and personnel spent on all of these CAR activities could have been better spent as resources to help the schools in need." He said the program "may well prove to be counterproductive."

However, he felt the CSIP procedure was helpful in that it brought problems to the forefront for teachers, administrators, and a parent to discuss. The process gave them a feeling of corroboration. A big problem with CSIP was the difficulty in having time during the school day to meet. He felt such meetings were counterproductive anyway, reducing the instructional time for students. Afterschool hours would be better, he said, and the committee used to meet then, but it still wasn't efficient, due to the limited reimbursements available for afterschool time.

He identified the school's biggest problem as the faulty distribution of resources--more should go directly to the schools, with the district and centralized bureaucracies kept to a bare minimum. He said that half the students are working at reading level, with the rest receiving the same calibre of services but not achieving. He said one can't attribute all the problems of the poorer achievers to the school, as its programs obviously serve half the student body adequately. He attributed many of his students' problems to factors outside his control--economic conditions in the neighborhood, poor housing, high student mobility, (only 36 percent stay in the school three years) and poor education backgrounds at home. The 50 percent of the students who are performing are probably those from stable backgrounds, he believes.

School C's CSIP committee meets an average of once every two weeks and has 12 members: the grade leaders and two cluster teachers, two administrators (the principal and A.P.), the librarian, a facilitator from Central, and one parent, who has not been able to attend many meetings at all, as she is not available during the day. The principal would like to get more parents involved in the Committee, but cites cost restraints. The teachers were self-selected, the P.A. nominated the parent. (He noted that the P.A.'s core group was very active, hosting Teacher Recognition day, cultural exchange lunches, and being involved in black history assemblies, while the bulk of parents outside of Project Giant Step were not.)

The Committee addresses issues of curriculum and school climate, including student and teacher morale. The curriculum is not being changed; discussion is focusing on methodology, effective instruction and classroom planning, and minimum materials to be covered in subject areas. The Committee members meet with the other teachers in their grade, have encouraged teachers to be creative in their instructional methods, and have worked to encourage teachers to use special programs and incentives to encourage students to achieve (see below). These are not new activities; the Committee is just using a peer group to encourage faculty involvement. The CSIP process has also resurrected the Social Committee, in charge of parties.

We spoke to the librarian, a member of the CSIP Committee, who said it is doing well, but the students aren't showing much improvement. Many come in unmotivated and unhappy. If they chose not to work on the computers, for example, because they "didn't feel like it," the teachers felt there wasn't much they could do to encourage them to participate.

Funds

CSIP funds only cover stipends for members' time. The principal didn't accept his, and doesn't know how much it amounted to per person. As far as he knows, additional funding is not available to elementary schools for the CSIP process. He believes too much goes to the central CSIP bureaucracy.

Staff Development

The Committee has responded to teacher needs by bringing in experts to teach the writing process to teachers, and providing a session on referrals to COH, which staff felt it needed. Other programs, however, do not reflect staff-identified needs. Most of the staff development in the school is schoolbased. The school also reviews lesson plans and holds grade conferences, to discuss curriculum, methods, and class management. Teachers have become involved in selecting curriculum material and making manipulatives for reading classes. The school holds a monthly faculty conference for 40 teachers. The principal disagrees with sending students home for in-service days, as it cuts down on instruction time.

The principal said school-based staff development is not the answer; what's really needed is for teachers to be better prepared when they come to the school. The education schools are not serving future teachers adequately, and maybe teachers should have a four-year internship before working in the schools. He also felt that the mentoring programs took away valuable instructional time.

Student Activities

School C's students wrote letters to Albany about the need for increased state aid. They participate in a reading marathon, and receive certificates for completing a certain number of books. The school also distributes a savings bond to a student in each grade who has excelled in reading. They have a bookworm contest, where each time a student completes a book, a segment with the student's name and the book's title is added to a paper bookworm on the bulletin board. Schoolwide silent reading time starts at 2:30 and was designed to encourage students to read on their own.

The library was well-stocked. Students can take books out of the library, but only if they have their parents' permission. The librarian has been able to order thousands of dollars worth of materials each year, but she complained that she lacked sufficient shelf space for them. She also wanted to be able to purchase video tapes and sets of more than six books. Current purchasing rules prohibit her from doing so.

Needs

In the principal's view the CSIP process is working within the parameters, and is effective, but not enough. More resources are needed. The school needs more support services, but this is not highest on the principal's agenda. He identified the need for smaller class size, improved teacher education, and more parent involvement in their children's education before they get to school. These efforts could help reduce the number of special education students. He also said pre-K education is vital, although it receives a disproportionate amount of resources. Currently 80 percent of his students don't receive it, and 40 percent of his students don't even go to kindergarten.

Project Giant Step

The program has a very active parent group, with life skills classes, read-aloud workshops, trips, and speakers about AIDS, homework, and substance abuse. There are 120 children, with 20 in a class, and two sessions a day. The program is full. The walls were decorated with student work and the kids seemed happy.

Basic School Staffing

School C received one position, an administrative assistant, through this initiative. This person was needed to help coordinate testing and the minischool, and B.S.S. provided "the easiest way to get the position."

Services to LEP Students

There are 13 bilingual classes, and none in ESL, as the bilingual staff teaches it. One bilingual position is funded through PCEN funds. All but one are fully licensed, and the students in the unlicensed teacher's class are almost bilingual, using the option to receive services after they test out. Most students (95 percent) test out of bilingual education before 4th grade, the school's terminal grade. Last year when the school's classes were divided heterogenously, the top bilingual class performed as well as the top English-speaking one. Sixty-five percent of the students are Hispanic.

The school has an LEP afterschool tutorial program, and Title VII funds have helped fund the school's computer room, which was well stocked. There are several bilingual paras. Services to LEP students have remained fairly constant recently.

Physical Plant

The school recently received a new custodian, after working hard documenting abuses so the two previous unsatisfactory ones could be transferred. The new custodian does his job well. The school received new furniture for Project Giant Step; otherwise there were no significant capital improvements. School C received $1,000 in MAC funds for bathroom repairs, as did every school in the district. It also participates in the Scorecard program, which visited the school twice and was marginally helpful. The school seemed to be in good repair.

SCHOOL D

CSIP

The school was designated as a CAR school in 1985, making this the second year of CSIP. The designation was detrimental to the school's morale, as it did not reflect the problems it faces and the good job teachers do despite severe overcrowding and underfunding. School D had its own school improvement plans before CSIP was invented, but the new plan is more closely documented.

The school's main problem was its reading scores. School D has a very high mobility rate and over 1,225 students in a school with a capacity of 735. There is no gym, as the old one holds four classes, no library, and six classrooms have been divided to provide more space. These divided rooms are not satisfactory, as the new partitions are not soundproof. Students have only thirty minutes for lunch due to overcrowding, and this cuts down on time teachers can devote to meetings about school improvement. Although the sixth grade moved to an annex five blocks away to alleviate overcrowding, the principal expects just as many new students in the school will replace them in September.

We met with the CSIP chair and the facilitator from the Central Board, who is also responsibile for three other elementary schools and a junior school. The Committee is currently revising its plan and incorporating new goals, to include the LEP population, particularly those who have just tested out of bilingual or ESL programs.

The Committee focuses on three issues: school climate, instruction, and organization/leadership. The following subcommittees address more specific concerns: reading, math, writing, morale, creative writing, positive image for all students, parent involvement, special education, and evaluation. These meet at the convenience of members, usually at 8:00 a.m.

There are twelve volunteer members of the Committee, according to state regulation, although at least 20 participate in the process. The members consistently complained about the lack of time when they could all meet together. The principal has trouble attending meetings just before or just after school, as he is always busy when students are entering or leaving the building, difficult times for parents, too. Parent attendance at CSIP meetings has not been very good.

The principal has visited the Dade County schools in Miami and spoke enthusiastically about school-based planning, given new union rules allowing rule changes if 75 percent of the staff agrees to them. When asked what sort of changes might be instituted, he said that would be entirely up to the staff. When pressed, he listed schedule changes, departmentalization, combined preps, and ungraded classes as possibilities. He has been the principal for 14 years,

and noted how programs don't work if people refer to them as "this is what he wants"--new ideas have to come from the staff. The teachers, he noted, are a bit hesitant to bring about change.

CSIP has resulted in a reference library for teachers, suggested by the reading committee. This has boosted morale. The school's mission statement has been helpful, and evidence of it could be seen on bulletin boards all over the school: "All students can succeed." Student, teacher, and parent involvement has increased.

The facilitator gave an outside perspective of the school, saying it had very high morale. The principal here clearly believes in the CSIP process, while other principals view their CSIP committees as advisory groups. She said elementary schools tend to have more successful CSIP groups, as they are more comfortable places to work, and teachers stay with their classes longer. Teachers at junior high schools tend to have more time constrictions and turf battles.

Funding

One of the first complaints about CSIP was the $120 honoraria given to committee members, not enough to cover time spent. The principal said his was the first school where the staff decided not to take the money but to use it for supplies. When teachers discovered that they were being taxed for that $120, they were furious. He said the best use of those funds would be for substitutes, so teachers could meet during the school day.

The school's CSIP chair complained about the time and money spent in retreats during the school day. She would rather have teachers decide how to spend those funds, in a way that would give them more time in class. Staff is troubled by the scarcity of substitutes. The CSIP facilitator had $400 in discretionary CSIP funds for the school, and allocated it toward science supplies.

The school also had a fundraiser, having students sell candy. They raised $1,000 for CSIP efforts, and provided $25 to each teacher for supplies or however they chose to spend it. The principal felt the sale gave students an unfortunate message, that they had to sell candy, something they'd been taught was unhealthy, to help the school stay above water. Funds were also used for math manipulatives, an accelerated reading program identified by the CSIP reading committee, and tutoring for five or six students reading less than a year below grade level.

Basic School Staffing funds were allocated to a teacher-in-charge of the minischool and an art teacher. Teachers chose these positions out of a list of five. The principal prefers anything to categoricals.

Parent Involvement

The guidance counselor has a parent group that meets monthly to talk about the problems of parenting. One of the counselor's sessions on testing attracted 55 parents to one meeting. The social worker also meets with parents. The district also hosts PRESTO, (Parents Reading English and Speaking it, Too) which isn't as well attended as hoped.

Staff Development

The principal complained about half-day staff development sessions, and said that having each grade dismissed early on separate days was inconvenient for parents with more than one child in the school. He has all the K-3 half-day inservices on the same day, but still notices that attendance is down then, as parents have trouble finding half-day child care. He would rather have full-day inservice, but was denied permission. This hurt staff morale, as teachers who saw a principal unable to institute a logical change wonder about the likelihood of success for their own initiatives.

The principal said the school has to run like a home, where people who are affected by decisions help make them. Teachers know the most about what they need and should decide what staff development they receive. He and the CSIP coordinator were disgusted by rules that prevented a teacher mentor from working with a TPD who requested her help. For the state mentoring program, School D uses retired teachers, as "it's foolish to do otherwise," according to the principal. Time and coverage are desperately needed. He said it's very hard to teachers to support their peers, because they always feel guilty that they should be with their classes.

AI/DP Program

The Public Education Association identified School D's AI/DP program as a model. It lost its AI/DP funding because it was in an elementary school, but the district superintendent has continued to fund it. It provides teachers to cover an afterschool detention program for at-risk students, and has staff calling parents if students are late, distributing banners for classes with 100% attendance, and hosting an awards assembly for students with few absences. The school's attendance rate is approximately 88-89 percent. The principal said it is difficult to ensure that his trainable mentally retarded students come to school, as they are often sick, and buses are not always reliable in the winter. The school has 10 special education classes.

LEP Services

There are two bilingual teachers for the kindergarten and first grade, two ESL teachers, and two paras. The bilingual teachers have common branch, not bilingual, certification. There are no bilingual guidance counselors. The principal said he has a waiting

list of teachers who want to work in his school, as people know it's a place where teachers can teach.

Physical Plant

About 100 windows were replaced recently, during school hours. The Board plans to waterproof, point and paint the school this summer. They have a "great" custodian, after removing the previous one. He paints the halls and even refinishes floors. No one had heard of the MAC funds, and the staff noted a need for maintenance.

SCHOOL E

CSIP

The school was cited on the first CAR list for its reading and math scores and poor attendance. For the previous five years it had been involved in the School Improvement Process, so staff bought into CSIP fairly easily, as they were used to comprehensive planning. The principal said the CSIP process made her work easier, "because when teachers are part of the planning, they have ownership of the changes, and they work harder." She described the current year as "a disaster," saying it was only because of the dedication of the staff that they've been able to carry on, due to numerous absences and positions that were vacant until January. "The plan went through, and it couldn't have if it had only been made up of my ideas," she said.

Improvements have been directed schoolwide, not toward any particular population. The school has instituted honors bulletin boards and attendance awards, and has hosted awards assemblies, to encourage students to come to school. Staff holds a Networking Day every Wednesday, she explained, when 99 percent of the staff meets on their lunch hours to share ideas, gripes, and strategies. They hold $2 breakfasts, when one of the teachers cooks. This helps meet the teachers' needs for socialization, though more needs to be done.

The principal said morale has improved greatly, and was not hurt by the CAR school designation. One of the CSIP Committee's major purposes was to increase collaboration among the staff. This was achieved when the principal let teachers order a.v. equipment themselves, instead of doing it herself, which had been easier. The teachers participate in the decision-making process now, and have also decided what to do with money raised through pretzel sales--they leased a xerox machine and got the piano tuned.

When we spoke to the CSIP chair in the teacher's room, however, she sounded deeply frustrated by staff vacancies, the inability to get supplies, and poor staff morale.

The Committee includes 13 volunteers, seven teachers, including representatives from Pre-K and MIS 1, the custodian, and two parents, including the PA president. The parents don't come to all the meetings, as they are very early in the morning. The principal said almost every staff member is involved in one of the subcommittees, and that next year the Committee will be larger.

The Committee is working to improve the school's test scores, helping students with test taking sophistication, including a new math cluster position, and supplies for individualizing students' reading programs. It has adopted sustained silent reading, and the librarian has focused on listening and study skills. She reads to the students and lets them take books out.

6/20

The school, with 700-750 students, is absolutely not overcrowded, although since it has 12 special ed classes, there are no extra rooms for new programs.

The principal identified staff shortages as the school's most serious problem. She often has trouble finding substitutes, although she doesn't know if School E has more difficulty than other inner city schools. At the beginning of May, the school still had one vacancy. She said the new transfer program was designed to integrate the system, but that she doesn't have many white teachers who want to work in her school. Teachers tend to stay there, she said, except for the ones she can't train. She writes these up or lets them go.

The Committee has a lot of programs in the works, including more parent involvement, a literacy program, and workshops about AIDS. The school has asked parents what workshops they want, but most haven't taken advantage of the offer. An AIDS workshop drew only 10-12 parents.

The CSIP process could be improved if more time were available to work on it. With the school's staffing difficulties, there is no one to cover teachers when they are in meetings. It is very difficult to plan a common prep or lunch hour.

Parent Involvement

Parents have input into what they want to see happen in the school, the principal said. They raised money for medals and awards, and they get things done where the school can't apply pressure, such as the district office, she said.

Staff Development

The mentor program has been a big help, the principal said, as teachers are willing to accept from their peers advice they wouldn't be able to take from their supervisors. There will be courses in assertive discipline next year. The teachers conduct the faculty meetings on topics they choose, such as use of an overhead projector. The CSIP facilitator has connections with the Central Board to arrange workshops centered around the needs of the school, and most have been effective. The Holt Company has also come in to do science sessions, as the teachers have been unhappy with the new books the school recently purchased from the company.

Special Programs

Project Giant Step is fantastic, the principal said, although the program could use more children. Part of the problem is the half-day session, not popular with working parents, especially when there is a full-day Pre-K at a nearby school. Project Giant Step

teachers are almost uniformly TPD teachers, but some have been directors of other four-year-old programs and are of very high quality. She doesn't mind TPDs per se, as long as they don't bounce from school to school annually. She says licensing doesn't make a teacher better or worse.

Basic School Staffing

The principal didn't know how her school's Basic School Staffing was used, although she thinks it was for a bilingual coordinator, needed because the school was out of compliance. The coordinator has formalized the bilingual/ESL program.

Services to LEP Students

There are three bilingual classes for grades K-3, including a bridge class for grades two and three. Students receive ESL classes from the bilingual coordinator. There are also three bilingual special ed teachers, for as many classes. Teachers are fully licensed. One class was added this year. The principal is not sure of the number of LEP students in the school. The CSIP Committee has identified guidance for LEP students as a necessity.

Physical Plant

The school was painted five years ago, and has benefited from the Handyman program. Toilets, windowshades, floor tiles, staff lounges, classroom furniture, pointing and waterproofing, and graffiti all received attention. Auditorium seats, windows, exit doors, gates, fences, and outside paving still need attention.

SCHOOL F

CSIP

The principal has only been in the school since September. She was previously at a magnet school for the gifted in Brooklyn, and had no prior experience with CSIP. She attended the Brooklyn College principals' conference, where they discussed the roles of teachers and parents. She found its focus on communication and how to deal with the lack thereof helpful. She has seen the difference in a school once communication improves.

Teachers, parents, and custodial staff all make suggestions toward the improvement of the school. The custodian has been a problem in the past, but the principal has tried not to antagonize him. The teachers were "ready to fight" when the principal first came to the school, but morale has improved significantly, probably due to a large part to the new principal.

The school appeared on the CAR list because of its math scores. In reading, 66 percent of the students are at grade level, but the principal wants that to reach 80. In the area of attendance, lateness is a problem, and the school may start distributing late passes if the situation doesn't improve.

To remedy the math scores, School F has adopted the SIMS math program, one she used in her old school. Paras will be trained to use the computer program, and there will be peer teaching and a master teacher going to other classrooms to provide training.

The principal said it was hard to say if the CSIP process has been effective. She has seen schools progress without having been cited on the CAR report, and after attending all the Committee meetings, she noted that some deteriorated into gripe sessions and were not educationally constructive. When meetings turned unprofessional she would tell people they were off base. The district facilitator has been "most helpful" in focusing the Committee's work.

The staff has had input into filling positions when they arise. They chose a drama cluster teacher.

The process has not increased the level of teacher collaboration, except for the teachers on the Committee, she said. CSIP meetings are afterschool from 3:00-5:00 p.m., and staff outside the Committee doesn't know much about its activities. The process has helped draw parents into the process, as one parent told us. "The teachers used to talk over our heads, but now we're much more involved."

Early grade students, who needed the most improvement, have benefitted most from CSIP, the principal said.

Parent Involvement

Three volunteer parents (the Parent Association's executive committee) have attended every CSIP meeting, and two others have attended others. Parents were involved in developing the curriculum for Black History Month, and contributed to a glee club performance and African folk tales play then.

One parent has six children who have attended School F. She is running for the head of the parent association, volunteers in the school every day, and visits classrooms regularly. She says she has seen significant improvement there. More of the kindergarteners and first graders are reading, and attendance is up. She said in the last six months she has seen "the war between parents and teachers" end, as both sides agreed they want the same thing, better services for students. Parents had been concerned that teachers and the administration were not responsive to their needs and their children's. Parents didn't understand the students' homework, so they couldn't help with it. The school has since sponsored a homework workshop, and they are no longer embarrassed when their kids ask for help.

The parent noted that students respect their teachers more and like math and science better recently. She appreciated the principal's habit of greeting the kids at the door, and noted they don't cut up as much as they used to. Being on the CAR report has helped a lot, she said. Kids want to stay in school now, and attend afterschool programs that teachers are willing to stay late to provide. The students have also been asking for summer programs and reading programs.

The parent said the school's biggest problem was its building, built in 1939. She and the principal complained that the auditorium was dark and depressed the children. (It had brown paint, with yellow near the ceiling, its lights were set too high in the ceiling.)

Parents monitor the front door and the bathrooms. Despite the sign in front of the school listing Parents Association meetings from the spring of 1986, the parent involvement in School F seemed very strong.

Basic School Staffing

Parents wanted an extra secretary for the school, which requested an Assistant Principal for its BSS funds. The principal called in the administrative assistant, to find out who was actually hired. After a long search, the assistant discovered that his own position had been funded through Basic School Staffing money.

Services to Limited English Proficient Students

The school has 100 LEP students, and has a bilingual bridge class for first and second graders. There isn't a large enough population for other classes. The school also has an ESL teacher,

and funding from the Central Board for materials the school needs. In total, there are three fully-licensed teachers and two partially-licensed paras at the school. For ESL reading classes, students are pulled out.

Physical Plant

The school recently received new locks and bathroom seats. Leaks on the fourth floor were repaired, as was a flooded bookroom. These still need painting. The school hosted (and loved) a SWAT team, which repaired windowshades and the plumbing in one day. The custodial staff has been keeping the school cleaner, coming in earlier to heat and clean the building. The principal also wants to get rid of the lead paint in the school, and says her school is on the priority list for this. The gym needs work, and there is a need for more furniture. She also wants a lock to put on the school yard, where she has found syringes and crack vials from people who use it after hours. Parents are working to raise funds for new lights and paint in the auditorium.

Special Programs

This summer the school will have a Summer Olympics, where students will receive medals according to the number of books they have read. Teachers are writing to the parents to encourage them to have the students participate.

The principal would like to see the school accept children from other neighborhoods, to increase the school's diversity. (This could be difficult, as it already has 1150 students and operates at 140 percent capacity, recently down from 165 percent. Students used to meet in storage rooms and closets.) Her old magnet school was first in Brooklyn. Currently there are gifted classes for grades three through five; additional courses in kindergarten through grade two are planned for next year. The program features museum visits, art classes, contests, and essay writing.

The principal recognizes the need to keep the library open, as long as teachers are there and students don't abuse the books. The librarian is very enthusiastic about a new Reading Rainbow program, and has videotaped students talking about their favorite books. He has ordered several new sets of books, including the Bonnie Bookworm series. The library is very well equipped, and he is asking teachers to take excess books, to develop classroom libraries.

We visited a special education class, where all eight of the students were black males. TPD teachers are not a problem in the school, except for in special ed, where two inexperienced ones didn't work out, according to the principal.

CSIP

We met with the acting princpal (as of September) and the assistant principal. The women said the school appeared on the CAR list because of its third grade reading and math scores in the 1983-84 school year. The school began its CSIP work in the spring of 1986. The principal has attended an all-day Saturday workshop with the district CSIP facilitator, who has since been transferred. There is a high turnover rate of facilitators in the district. No facilitator had been assigned there, so the school borrowed one from another. This facilitator became overworked and left. The three CSIP subcommittees began meeting monthly in 1986, with the school climate committee having the most success. In all, 17 people are involved, including two parents, one who attends consistently. Members "volunteered or were coaxed" to join.

According to the principal and a.p., the school shouldn't have been designated a CAR school, as it qualified only by half a percentage point, has a temporary administrator, and met all the standards as of Spring 1987. They did not attribute the school's improvement to the CSIP process. (It appears that the previous school leadership was seen as part of the school's problems.) Unlike other schools visited, School G does not receive Chapter I funds, so teachers only have two preps a week and no extra personnel. Grade conferences can only be held once a month, although the CSIP Committee has suggested they meet more often. The Committee itself meets in the morning, and last year had consistently good turnout. "We're still continuing, but not with the same intensity," the a.p. said.

The women felt CSIP, which brought with it only a $500 allotment, promised a great deal, but what was promised couldn't be given, in part because the school didn't receive Chapter I funds. Teachers' expectations, for more staff development, materials, personnel, and visits to other schools and programs, weren't met. They misunderstood what they would be given, the women said, as they had expected funding to accompany the goals the Committee set. The staff felt they had sacrificed a lot and not received much in return. They recently began a writing workshop, one they felt they could've gotten on their own without going through CSIP.

The a.p. noted, however, that the process did help focus attention and improve administrative style in the school. And as the school has improved, they think maybe it was good that they worked together after all--the principal answered with "a hesitant yes" when asked if the process increased the level of collaboration among the staff. The Committee sent out questionnaires to the entire staff, and everyone receives minutes to the CSIP meetings. CSIP's timing was good in that teachers got to work directly with

the new principal. Morale is better this year, according to the a.p., either because of CSIP or due to factors she said she didn't want to discuss.

Last year the Committee told the former principal it didn't want to continue the CSIP process, as they had met the standards, and all but two members, the guidance counselor and a.p., quit. The Committee chair also stayed on, but as a member.

The Committee has focused on ESL, special education, and reading. They have gone over the goals they had last year to see if they've been attained, how they are progressing in relation to their original plan, and what they will be doing next year. They have complained about the amount of paperwork involved.

The school has had personnel problems, receiving too many inexperienced staff. When asked how the CSIP process could be improved, the administrators said they needed shelves in a divided room upstairs so teachers could have a resource center. The existing one in the library is hard to use, since the library is not always open.

They also need to evaluate their placement process for special education students, as if you send kids to school without proper services, both the special education and regular students suffer, as the staff's attention is diverted. There are three MIS 2 programs, for emotionally handicapped students, four MIS 1 programs, for those with learning disabilities, and two resource room pullout programs.

Parent Involvement

Parents help with fundraising, shows, artwork, communications, and informing the administration if they see a student with a problem, for example, if they see a young child walking to school alone. They meet monthly. A group of reading volunteers, adults and seniors, comes in to tutor students who need help but aren't eligible for PSEN funds.

Staff Development

School G, along with three other schools in the district, has participated in the Writing Project, as well as district staff development in social studies, gifted programs, and early childhood. Staff development occurs at grade conferences, when the school invites district people in to address their concerns, about issues such as the SIMS math program.

Basic School Staffing

School G received .9 positions, which funded a librarian, to provide preps for teachers. This was added to 2.6 units of cluster time. The new librarian is not a teacher of library, but replaces

the former librarian, who is on maternity leave. The principal was pleased with the funds, as the administration and teachers know the school's needs best, and Basic School Staffing funds allowed for flexibility.

Services to LEP Students

There is one bilingual special ed class and one pull-out ESL program. The school has had a problem with students entering the school from foreign countries who have had very little previous education. The principal mentioned she had third graders who had never been to school before. The school can offer them limited services, as there is only one PCEN teacher. Some go to the bilingual special ed class, and the ESL teacher works with others on her own. They have to be tested in September for their language skills.

Physical Plant

The school has received no MAC money, and has no problem with its custodian. It needs its school yard fixed this spring, and could use refurbishing in general, the principal said. If the school took more than its current 775-800 children, it would be overcrowded, she added.

Representatives to the Educational Priorities Panel

Suzanne Vine	Advocates for Children
Harriet Bogard, Seymour Samuels	American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter
Sara Schwabacher	American Reading Council
Luis Reyes	ASPIRA of New York
Michael Goldfarb	Association for the Help of Retarded Children
Lisa Syron	Center for Public Advocacy Research
Phyllis Rovine, Marge Scheuer	Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.
Dorothy Silverman	The City Club of New York
Jerry Shroder	Community Council of Greater New York
Eleanor Stier	Community Service Society
Margaret Nuzum	The Junior League of Brooklyn
Page Bigelow	The Junior League of New York City
Lorraine Pulis	League of Women Voters of New York City
Nona Smith, Marcella Maxwell	Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP
Shirley McCain	National Black Child Development Institute, Inc.
Muriel Carrington	New York Coalition of 100 Black Women
Glenn Pasanen	New York Urban Coalition
Cynthia Banks	New York Urban League
Mary Martin	Presbytery of New York City
Stephen Calenzani	PROGRESS, Inc.
Judy Baum, Muriel Vitriol	Public Education Association
Miguel Salazar	Resources for Children with Special Needs, Inc.
Richard Murphy	Rheedlen Foundation
Mary Grace Eapen	United Neighborhood Houses
Rue Zalia Watkins	United Parents Associations
Stuart Buice	Women's City Club of New York